EXHIBIT B

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1112-2 Filed: 03/28/19 Entered: 03/28/19 16:34:16 Page 1

of 130

	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	000
5	In re:
6	PG&E CORPORATION, BANKRUPTCY CASE
7	-and- Case No.19-30088 (DM)
8	PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC Chapter 11
	COMPANY, (Lead Case)
9	
	Debtors. (Jointly Administered)
10	
	/
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	DEPOSITION OF DOUGLAS FRISKE
17	THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2019
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Reported by:
23	Anrae Wimberley
24	CSR No. 7778
25	Job No. 3264070

	Page 2
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	000
5	In re:
6	PG&E CORPORATION, BANKRUPTCY CASE
7	-and- Case No.19-30088 (DM)
8	PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC Chapter 11
	COMPANY, (Lead Case)
9	
	Debtors. (Jointly Administered)
10	
	/
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	Transcript of deposition of DOUGLAS
18	FRISKE, taken at Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph
19	LLP, One Sansome Street, Suite 2800, San Francisco,
20	California 94104, beginning at 1:12 p.m. and ending
21	at 3:17 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2019, before
22	Anrae Wimberley, Certified Shorthand Reporter No.
23	7778.
24	
25	

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	For the Tort Committee:
3	BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
4	BY: ROBERT A. JULIAN, ESQ.
5	1160 Battery Street East, Suite 100
6	San Francisco, California 94111
7	(628) 208-6436
8	rjulian@bakerlaw.com
9	-and-
10	BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
11	BY: CATHERINE E. WOLTERING, ESQ.
12	45 Rockefeller Plaza
13	New York, New York 10111
14	(614) 462-2677
15	cwoltering@bakerlaw.com
16	
17	Financial Advisor to the Tort Committee:
18	LINCOLN INTERNATIONAL LLC
19	BY: BRENDAN J. MURPHY, MANAGING DIRECTOR
20	500 West Madison Street, Suite 3900
21	Chicago, Illinois 60661
22	(212) 257-7751
23	bmurphy@lincolninternational.com
24	
25	

	Page 4
1	For the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors:
2	MILLBANK LLP
3	BY: DANIEL DENNY, ESQ.
4	JULIE WOLF, ESQ. (VIA PHONE)
5	2029 Century Park East, 33rd Floor
6	Los Angeles, California 90067-3019
7	(213) 703-9980
8	ddenny@milbank.com
9	jwolf@milbank.com
10	
11	For the Debtors PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas And
12	Electric Company:
13	BY: RICHARD SLACK, ESQ.
14	DAVID R. SINGH, ESQ.
15	STEPHEN KAROTKIN, ESQ.
16	JESSICA LIOU, ESQ.
17	201 Redwood Shores Parkway
18	Redwood Shores, California 94065-1134
19	(650) 802-3020
20	richard.slack@weil.com
21	david.singh@weil.com
22	stephen.karotkin@weil.com
23	jessica.liou@weil.com
24	
25	

	Page 5
1	Also Present:
2	MARK KAZMIEROWSKI, Managing Director for
3	Willis Towers Watson
4	
5	CHRIS KIM, FIT Consulting, Financial
6	Advisor to the Tort Committee (VIA PHONE)
7	000
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

		P	age 6
-			
1		INDEX	
2	EXAMINATION E	3Y:	PAGE
3	MR. JULIAN		8
4		000	
5		EXHIBITS	
6			
7	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
8	Exhibit 19	Pacific Gas and Electric	81
9		Company's Wildfire Mitigation	
10		Plan; 182 pages	
11			
12	Exhibit 20	SoCalGas and SDG&E, Direct	85
13		Testimony of Debbie S. Robinson	
14		(Compensation and Benefits);	
15		261 pages	
16			
17	Exhibit 21	Decision Ordering Pacific Gas	27
18		and Electric Company to Implemen	nt
19		the Recommendations of the	
20		NorthStar Report; 9 pages	
21			
22	Exhibit 22	Assessment of Pacific Gas and	27
23		Electric Corporation and Pacific	
24		Gas and Electric Company Safety	
25		Culture; 42 pages	

					Page	7
QUESTION	WITNESS	INSTRUCTED	NOT	ТО	ANSWER:	
		PAGE	LINE			
		4 9	16			
		000				
	QUESTION	QUESTION WITNESS	PAGE 49	PAGE LINE	PAGE LINE 49 16	QUESTION WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER: PAGE LINE 49 16

	Page 8
1	THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2019; SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA;
2	1:12 P.M.
3	
4	DOUGLAS FRISKE,
5	sworn as a witness by the Certified
6	Shorthand Reporter, testified as follows:
7	EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. JULIAN:
9	Q. Would you please state your full name for
10	the record.
11	A. Douglas Friske.
12	Q. Friske, not Friske?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. Is Exhibit 17 a copy of your corrected
15	declaration that you signed in connection with the
16	debtors' motion for approval of their short-term
17	incentive plan?
18	A. It is.
19	Q. And may we refer to the short-term
20	incentive plan for 2019 as the "STIP" in this case,
21	in your deposition?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Who hired you, actually?
24	A. Weil Gotshal.
25	Q. Who at Weil hired you?

Α.	$M\nabla$	contact	was	Steve	Karotkin.

- Q. Did he explain the purpose of your retention?
 - A. He did.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

- O. What was it?
- A. To help the company think through compensation strategies in light of ongoing discussions around potential restructuring.
- Q. Do you have a prior relationship with anyone on PG&E's board or executive team?
 - A. No.
- Q. And what were the terms of Willis Towers Watson's engagement with Weil on behalf of the debtors?
 - A. With respect to terms, just to be clear --
 - Q. Compensation terms.
- A. So we were paid on a time-and-expense basis based on the time we spent on the matter with an initial retainer amount.
 - O. What was the retainer?
 - A. \$150,000.
 - Q. And who's on your team?
- A. Myself, Mark Kazmierowski, and then I
 don't know the other individuals. Mark worked with
 others on the staff to do analyses.

	Ο.	About	how	many	people	on	the	staff?
--	----	-------	-----	------	--------	----	-----	--------

- A. That worked on this engagement?
- O. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

24

- A. I would guess probably three to four.
- Q. And by "this engagement," which engagement are you referring to?
- A. The engagement I referred to earlier with PG&E through Weil.
- Q. Did you work on any project other than formulating or assisting the compensation committee to formulate the 2019 STIP?
- A. As I mentioned, we were working with the committee on a variety of different compensation matters.
- Q. Do you expect to provide any advice to the debtors on any other employee-related bonus plan?
 - MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- MR. JULIAN: Withdrawn.
- 19 BY MR. JULIAN:
 - Q. Do you expect to provide advice to the debtors on any other employee-related compensation plans?
 - A. To be determined at this point. So I think depends on what their needs are.
 - Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether or

not there's a single most important compensation metric for employees of a utility?

A. I do not.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

- Q. About how much time have you and your team spent working on the 2019 STIP engagement?
- A. We were engaged in December. And over the course of that time -- just trying to estimate.

 You're thinking in terms of hours? Is that what --
 - Q. If you can, sure.
 - A. Yeah.

Probably in aggregate -- I'm trying to do the math based on our billing hours, billing rates -- couple hundred hours.

- Q. About how much time have you personally spent on the 2019 STIP engagement?
 - A. Thirty to forty hours.
 - Q. Who did you work with at PG&E?
- A. Worked primarily with John Lowe, who is the head of rewards PG&E.
 - Q. Did you say "rewards" or "awards"?
 - A. Rewards, r-e, reward.
- Q. And who did your team work with in addition to Mr. Lowe?
- A. We've worked with Kevin O'Connell, who works for John. We've also had discussions with

Dinyar Mistry and also had discussions with the compensation committee.

- Q. Who was on the compensation committee that you had discussions with?
- A. All of the compensation committee members in terms of the meetings, so all four committee members. And then I had other discussions with Forrest Miller, who was the chair of the compensation committee.
 - Q. He's also the chairman of the board?
 - A. I don't know. He could be.
- Q. The four members of the compensation committee with whom you met, were they all directors, as far as you understand?
 - A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

- Q. And when you say "compensation committee," was the compensation committee of PG&E Corp., the holding company, or Pacific Gas and Electric Company, the utility?
- A. It's my understanding it's the Corp., the corporation.
 - Q. The holding company?
 - A. The holding company. Sorry. Yes.
 - Q. Where did you get that understanding from?
 - A. First based on -- our engagement letter

talks about being with PG&E Corporation. And also looking at their proxy statement, those are the individuals listed in the proxy statement of the company. So I interpret that to be in the area of the holding company.

- Q. Did you have any understanding as to whether or not the compensation committee's charter was to deal with compensation of the executives only?
 - A. No. I didn't review the charter.
- Q. Did you understand that the compensation committee with whom you dealt had a charge to deal with compensation of employees of PG&E, the utility?
- A. I'm not familiar with the distinction between the utility versus the holding company.
- Q. Okay. At any rate, did you understand that the compensation committee was working on compensation for employees as opposed to executives?
 - A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

- Q. Who did you get that understanding from?
- A. From management and the committee in terms of our discussions with them.
- Q. Let's turn to your corrected declaration,
 Exhibit 17. I'm just going to go through some of
 it. I could ask you questions without going through

it, but -- when was the last time you read it?

A. Yesterday.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. When did you get out here?
- A. This morning.
 - Q. Good for you.

 How was the flight?
- A. It was great, except I had to wait for the gate. It's classic, right. You get here 10 minutes early, and then you sit and wait for the gate for 45 minutes.
- Q. If it was raining today in San Francisco, you would have been two or three hours late.

By the way, just out of fairness to you, if you want to follow with me, I'm on page 3, line 26/27.

How did you and your team familiarize yourself with the debtors' operations?

- A. Several ways: One, having discussions with senior management, the individuals I referenced earlier, particularly John Lowe and Kevin O'Connell; to talking with their advisors, particularly the individuals from Weil; and then, three, reviewing documents that they sent us with respect to their existing incentive plans.
 - Q. What documents did they send to you with

1 respect to the existing incentive plans?

- A. Background in terms of the plans, plan documents that describe the plans.
 - O. What was the title of the document?
- A. I don't know.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

2.2

- Q. Did they send you any other documents other than the plan documents?
- A. They could have. I didn't review all the documents. My colleagues reviewed them.
- Q. Is Exhibit 2 one of the documents that they gave you to review?

There's a section on the 2017 and 2018

STIPs toward the end. Starts at page WP 4-34.

14 Mr. Friske, way at the end.

15 A. Okay. 434; right?

MR. SLACK: No. No. 4-34. So 4 dash 34.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I see what you're saying

18 sorry. 4-34.

19 (Witness reviews document.)

20 THE WITNESS: No.

21 BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. 4-35?

A. I did not review this document, no.

24 0. 4-36?

25 A. No.

Page 16 4-37? Ο. 1 2. Α. No. 4-38? Ο. 3 No. 4 Α. Ο. 4-39? 5 6 Α. No. How about 4-40 and -41? Ο. No. 8 Α. 9 Did your team submit a formal report on the 2019 STIP to the debtors? 10 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the 11 12 question. 13 THE WITNESS: Repeat the question. BY MR. JULIAN: 14 15 Ο. Yeah. 16 Did you -- did your company submit a formal written report to Weil or the debtors with 17 respect to the 2019 STIP? 18 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form. 19 20 THE WITNESS: We provided a report to the 21 compensation committee on the plan, yes, on the 2019 2.2 STIP. BY MR. JULIAN: 23 Okay. And also -- going back to your 24 declaration, Exhibit 17. 25

What did you do to -- what did you and your team do to familiarize yourselves with the debtors' business goals?

- A. Reviewed documents they sent us that would have the goals that were in them in the 2018 STIP.

 Also talked to management as well in terms of the goals that they had in the 2018 STIP.
- Q. What did the debtors and their advisors tell you about the debtors' operational history?
- A. Just with respect to the goals themselves, how they were performing relative to those goals that were in the 2018 STIP. It was really focused on the goals that were in the STIP.
 - O. How so?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

- A. How so -- could you -- how so --
- Q. What did they tell you about the goals in the 2018 STIP?
- A. Just how they were performing relative to those goals. Okay. Here are the goals we have in the STIP, and this is the general trends of how we're performing against those goals.
- Q. By "goals" are you referring to the performance metrics?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And did they explain anything else to you

about the debtors' operational history other than what you've just told me?

A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. What did the debtors and their advisors explain to you about the debtors' financial performance?
- A. Beyond what was, again, relative to what they had in the 2018 STIP --
 - O. Sure.
 - A. -- not -- not anything that I recall.
- Q. What did the debtors and their advisors explain to you about various issues about the debtors' work force and employees' programs?
 - A. Nothing that I recall.
 - Q. On page 4, line 5, of your declaration --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- you testified that "The debtors performed significant due diligence in developing the 2019 STIP."
- What "due diligence" are you referring to there?
- A. So with respect to the due diligence in that STIP, looking at the metrics that they were going to use as part of the STIP, so the performance metrics with safety -- the category of safety,

financial and customer service. In addition to that, the goals that they were setting relative to those metrics.

In terms of the due diligence, it's just talking about whether those metrics were in line with the priorities of the organization and then whether the goals themselves were appropriate.

Q. What did you do to determine -- withdraw the question.

Did you do anything to determine whether or not the safety goals were appropriate?

A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

Q. On page 5 of your declaration, line 4, you testified that "The debtors' compensation committee (with the assistance of WTW) conducted a thorough evaluation of the debtors' existing STIP for purposes of formulating the 2019 STIP."

What thorough evaluation of the debtors' existing STIP did the compensation committee, with your assistance, perform?

A. It reviewed the metrics that were used in the 2018 STIP. It reviewed the weightings that were applied to those metrics in the 2018 STIP. It reviewed the performance period, the annual -- fact that it's measured over an annual performance period

as part of the STIP and then the range of performance, the fact that somebody could earn zero versus up to 200 percent of target under the plan, were the primary aspects of it that I was involved in, in terms of the review that I was involved in.

Q. And when you conducted that evaluation, was the word "the metrics" in the same form as in your declaration, that is the metrics that ended up being proposed to the court?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: So when I reviewed -- I'm sorry --

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. When you first reviewed the debtors' proposed 2019 STIP, were the metrics in the form exactly like it is on page 7 of your declaration?
- A. I don't recall the details under each of the metrics to know whether there were any modifications made to the metrics. I know initially the weights were slightly different than when we first reviewed it. Beyond that --
 - Q. So let's go -- I appreciate it.

 Did I cut you off?
 - A. No.

1	Q. Let's go back to Exhibit 2 for a baseline.
2	Go to that page WP dash
3	MR. SLACK: WP 4 dash.
4	BY MR. JULIAN:
5	Q 38 and 39. There you go.
6	A. So this is the 28 2018, I should say.
7	Q. Yeah.
8	So Mr. Mistry identified this as the 2018
9	STIP structure and performance targets in his
10	deposition.
11	You'll see that, for example, the Public
12	Safety Index has 10 percent weight for three things:
13	Vegetation non-exempt pole clearing, 25 percent;
14	routine line vegetation management, 50 percent; and
15	tree mortality mitigation program, 25 percent.
16	And if you go back to your declaration,
17	you'll see that has changed in the wording to
18	"enhanced vegetation management and system
19	hardening."
20	So does that refresh your recollection as
21	whether withdraw the question.
22	Let me ask you, which format was the STIP
23	in when you first started working on it?
24	MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

You can answer.

25

BY MR.	JULIAN	:
--------	--------	---

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2.5

- Q. The 2018 version or the one that you have in front of you, 2019?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall what the original version of the 2019 STIP metrics were.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Okay. Back to your declaration, page 5.
 We left off at line 5; right?
- A. Um-hum.
- Q. You testified, "This evaluation resulted in a modification of the performance metrics to put a greater emphasis on safety and financial performance and the timing and level of potential awards to address the uncertainties associated with the Chapter 11 cases in the absence of any LTIP grants in 2019."

Let me ask you a question about the first part of your answer -- or testimony.

What modification was made in the performance metrics to put a greater emphasis on safety?

- A. Well, I'm referring to the greater emphasis on safety and financial performance.
 - Q. So that's a question on my part.

Were there any modifications made between the 2018 STIP and the 2019 STIP that resulted in a greater emphasis on safety?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: Relative to the weight that was placed on safety in both the 2018 and the 2019 plans, both had 50 percent of the weighting under the STIPs applied to them. So from that standpoint, both had equal weighting relative to safety, but in both were the most significant component of the STIP, in both cases.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. When you say "both were," what --
- A. I'm sorry. The 2018 STIP and the 2019
 STIP both had 50 percent of the overall performance weighting aligned with safety.
- Q. Well -- thank you. So they both had the same weighting.

Was there greater emphasis on safety in the 2019 than the 2018 STIP, in your view, in any respect?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Beyond the weighting being equivalent, I can't speak to whether there's more

emphasis in terms of the underlying metrics that were in them. To me both had 50 percent tied to safety.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

- Q. Was there a greater emphasis on financial performance in the 2019 STIP versus the 2018 STIP?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. How so?
- A. The weighting on financial performance was increased from 25 percent of the overall performance score in the 2018 STIP to 40 percent of the overall performance weighting in the 2019 STIP.
 - Q. Who first proposed that?
- A. I first proposed increase in the weight on financial performance as part of my initial guidance to the committee, the compensation committee.
 - Q. What were your reasons?
- A. That in a restructuring situation, in particular, but in general in companies, by having a strong focus on financial results can provide benefits to all stakeholders, by having a viable entity that -- which you can make investments in safety and people across the enterprise. So it really starts with having a strong financial base in which to fund all of those investments.

Q.	S	o you're	sayin	g that	factor	is	applicable
whether	in 1	bankrupto	cy or	not?			

- A. I would say arguably -- yes, to answer your question. In fact, I'd say it's actually more applicable in bankruptcy given the nature of the situation in terms of trying to maintain the estate to maximize value for all stakeholders.
 - Q. Did you explain that to the committee?
 - A. I did.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. Did anyone explain a contrary view?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.
 - THE WITNESS: In what way? Is there -- BY MR. JULIAN:
 - Q. Did anyone say that the performance factor should stay at 25 percent?
- A. The performance factor for the financial metric should stay at 25 percent?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. There was discussion around the entire plan, so in terms of the weightings and the different metrics and how they're constructed.
- Q. Did anyone say to you, we think it should be staying at 25 percent, the financial performance?
 - A. I don't recall that statement, no, of

- 1 anybody making that statement.
- Q. Was it a close debate on going from 25 to 40?
 - MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure how you define

"close," what a close debate would be. But, yeah,
in fact, I think initially we had suggested a

35 percent weighting on financial. And so there's
discussions beginning to think about it. As the
committee talked about it, it was modified to
40 percent in subsequent discussions.

BY MR. JULIAN:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

2.2.

23

Q. Did anyone give you any audits or reports on safety to consider in making that recommendation?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

17 THE WITNESS: No.

18 BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Did anyone give you any reports or orders by the PUC with respect to safety?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- Q. Anyone give you any reports or orders from the PUC with regard to modification of the STIP?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 | MR. JULIAN: Show you Exhibits 21 and 22.

1 (Tort Committee Exhibits 21 and 22 were marked.)

BY MR. JULIAN:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. I'm going to identify each one for the record.
 - A. Go ahead.

MR. JULIAN: Exhibit 21 is the decision ordering Pacific Gas and Electric Company to implement the recommendations of the NorthStar report. Date of issuance, December 5, 2018. Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California in Investigation 15-08-019.

And Exhibit 22, on the second page, is entitled, "Assessment of Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company Safety Culture. Prepared for California Public Utilities Commission. May 8, 2017. Final Report, By NorthStar Consulting Group."

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. And I'll represent to you -- this is a couple hundreds pages long, but I've taken excerpts out of it.

So let me start with Exhibit 21.

Have you ever seen Exhibit 21 before?

A. I don't believe so, no.

- Q. Did you and your team consider Exhibit 21 in connection with your STIP work for the debtors?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of, no.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

- Q. Have you ever seen Exhibit 22 before, a Safety Culture Report by NorthStar Consulting Group?
 - A. No, not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. So Exhibit 21, let's look at that.

At the last page of this PUC order, PUC has ordered Pacific Gas and Electric Company to implement the recommendations set forth in the NorthStar report no later than July 1, 2019; right?

- A. I see that, yes.
- Q. And then paragraph 2 of the order says,
 "Pacific Gas and Electric Company is ordered to
 submit quarterly reports on the status of its
 implementation of the recommendations set forth in
 the NorthStar report to the Commission's safety
 enforcement division and to serve those reports to
 the service list for this proceeding beginning the
 fourth quarter of 2018."

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Now, I understand you're not familiar with this document, Exhibit 22, but I'm going to take you to the last three pages, to the recommendations of

1 NorthStar to which the PUC order refers.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

So we're looking at the third-to-the-last page, which is marked VII-19, and the recommendations on the bottom of that page.

Do you see that?

- A. The highlighted -- well, I see the recommendations for PG&E, yes.
 - Q. So let's start before the highlighting.

The first sentence of the recommendations by NorthStar, which the PUC has ordered be considered, are "None of the key performance indicators currently considered for use in measuring safety culture should be included as an incentive measure," as part of the STIP or the LTIP.

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Did anyone tell you that the PUC had ordered PG&E to implement that recommendation?
 - A. No.
- Q. The next highlighted part in that paragraph says, "Most of the proposed metrics are based on either employee surveys or near hit/CAP reporting. Incentives tied to employee submittals will ensure targets are met and may minimize the value of the submittals (for example, a sudden

influx of not particularly meaningful submittals prior to the end of a reporting period). Similarly, an incentive tied to survey results will drive positive reporting rather than true results."

Did you or your team look at anything dealing with that subject in evaluating the metrics?

A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

Q. Paragraph 4, recommendation reads,

"Re-evaluate the appropriateness of the earning from operations component of the STIP due to its lack of transparency and the ongoing adjustments for items impacting comparability."

Did anyone tell you that recommendation had been ordered by the PUC?

- A. They did not.
- Q. Did or your team evaluate the appropriateness of earning from operations component of the 40 percent financial performance metric?
- A. We did consider an earnings from operation-like measure, a profit measure. And all -- in fact, all of PG&E's peers have some form of financial metric in their incentive plan, their STIP equivalent. Many companies have different definitions of that.

So we didn't get into the exact details of

this particular measure, but the very fact of having an earnings from operations or an operating earnings-type measure is very common, and we considered that in our deliberations.

- Q. What did you tell the compensation committee about the propriety of an earning from operations component of the STIP?
- A. That having some form of earnings metric, an earnings from operation metric, would be very common with companies in general. It's common -- their industries peers and even more common in a restructuring. Some definition of a metric of operating earnings or cash flow, which is oftentimes a synonymous metric, is very common in a restructuring situation.
 - Q. Have you heard of NorthStar before?
 - A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

2.5

- Q. Does it surprise you that some report was made to the PUC that they adopted, said that the current emphasis on financial performance had the lack of transparency to it?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm not familiar with NorthStar or their work, so I can't really comment on the

propriety of any of the comments in the document.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Do you think there's any lack of transparency in the financial performance metric?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. The fifth recommendation is to "Revisit all STIP metrics and targets in light of the enterprise-wise Safety plan recommended by NorthStar."

Did you do that?

- A. We did not -- I did not.
- Q. Pardon me?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2.5

- A. I did not, no.
- Q. Did your team do that?
- A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- Q. The next sentence reads, "Set multiyear targets to drive performance."

Did your team make that recommendation?

- A. No, because typically in a restructuring, you don't have multiyear targets. If anything, you would have shorter term targets through the restructuring process.
- Q. You said "No, because," so does that mean you knew about this recommendation?
 - MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the

1 question.

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: No. I'm sorry. I thought you asked me if we looked at multiyear targets, not relevant to this -- to this specific -- just in general, the concept of multiyear targets.

- BY MR. JULIAN:
- Q. You wouldn't normally do that, is what you're saying?
- A. We would not normally have multiyear targets in an incentive plan -- a STIP-like incentive plan for a company in a restructuring situation.
- Q. The next sentence reads, "Include a contractor safety metric in the STIP."

Did you advise the committee to include a contractor safety metric in the STIP?

- A. No, we didn't -- no, we didn't advise any specific safety metrics.
- Q. Does the 2019 STIP have a contractor safety metric in it?
 - A. I don't know. I don't believe so.
- Q. Next sentence recommends, "Following the development of the enterprise safety plan, PG&E should develop STIP and BPR metrics that measure plan implementation adoption and the effectiveness

of	the	various	initiatives	identified	in	the	plan."

- Do you have any idea what that means?
- A. Not really. I don't know what "BPR" stands for. I think it's just saying they should have these types of metrics. But, no -- beyond that, no, I don't know what it's saying.
- Q. Last page, on Point No. 4, highlighted that. This is a recommendation for the Commission. The highlighted portion reads, "As with any incentive mechanism, the potential for gaming is real."

Did you evaluate whether there was a potential for gaming in the PG&E 2019 STIP?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what "gaming" means in the context of this point. So, no, because I don't know what they mean by "gaming."

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Do you know if any -- well, let's explore

that.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Do you know if any of the 2019 metrics relied upon PG&E employees' reports of the success of safety measures or financial performance?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

1 THE WITNESS: I don't.

BY MR. JULIAN:

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. Do you understand my question?
- A. You asked me if the metrics rely on employees reporting results as the basis for determining performance under the 2019 STIP.
 - O. Yes.
- A. And I don't know exactly the basis for the metrics.
- Q. What you're saying is that there could be, there could not be; you just don't know?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Got it.

I think what they're saying about gaming is if the metrics rely upon individual employee's reports of their performance, they could be gaming the system in order to make the performance metrics' targets met?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: Well, I can't speak to what they're referring to because that's -- you're speculating what they may be saying.

But I will say that in any incentive plan, there is always the possibility that individuals

could somehow manipulate results to improve the performance of the plan. That's a function of any incentive plan and whether -- whoever measures it. And that's why there are systems in plan to guard against that, governing systems, auditing systems, so forth.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

Q. Do you have any opinion as to whether or not you believe PG&E should have given you this Exhibit 21 and 22 in order for you to do your job on the 2019 STIP?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe that it was necessary for us to have seen this input. This is input for them to consider in determining the appropriate performance metrics.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. And you did not do that?
- A. Do what? I'm sorry.
- Q. Did you determine appropriate performance metrics?
- A. No, we did not determine the performance metrics for the plan.
- Q. What did you do with respect to performance metrics?

A. We observed the performance metrics that

were -- that had been used in the 2018 STIP and were

being proposed in the 2019 STIP and provided input

as to whether or not -- as a general class of

metrics, safety, customer satisfaction, financial,

whether those types of metrics are common metrics in

incentive plans.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

- Q. Did you advise the committee on whether those metrics in the 2019 STIP plan were reasonable?
- A. Again, the broad category of metrics, safety, financial, customer engagement, having those types of metrics in the 2019 STIP, yes, we did advise them that those types of metrics in a STIP plan, investment plan, are reasonable -- is reasonable.
- Q. Don't you think you should have been given an order that talks about whether those types of metrics are reasonable?

MR. SLACK: Asked and answered. Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Again, what we advised on was having these types of metrics. We did not advise on what specific metrics within those categories were most effective at helping them achieve their business objectives.

BY	MR.	JULIAN:	
----	-----	---------	--

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Let's go through some of the documents in front of you. We'll start with Exhibit 3.

Were you given a copy of Exhibit 3?

- A. No, not that I'm aware of.
- O. Exhibit 4?
- MR. SLACK: Can I -- sorry.

What do I push on this? I'm not familiar with --

(Discussion off the record.)

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Exhibit 4 is Judge Montali's order authorizing the establishment of a management retention program dated July 13, 2001 in the first Pacific Gas and Electric Company Chapter 11.

Did you and your team consider this order?

- A. No.
- Q. Exhibit 5 is an e-mail chain among Pacific Gas employees about the Caribou-Palermo line.

I don't suppose you looked at this.

- A. No.
- Q. Exhibit 6 is CAL FIRE's April 28, 2016 news release determining the cause of the destructive Butte fire.

	Did	vour	team	consider	that?
--	-----	------	------	----------	-------

A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q. Exhibit 7 is an e-mail chain dealing with near hits on the Caribou-Palermo line, among other things.

Did your team review this?

- A. No.
- Q. Exhibit 8 is the judgment in the criminal case brought against Pacific Gas arising out of the San Bruno gas explosion.

Did your team consider that?

- A. No, did not review this.
- Q. Are you aware that Pacific Gas was convicted of various counts of gas pipeline safety violations in connection with the San Bruno explosion?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I had seen reports that there had been actions in the past, so I was aware of general.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Did you consider that in connection with your engagement?
 - A. No.
- Q. And are you aware that the jury convicted
 Pacific Gas of obstructing the National

Transportation and Safety Board's investigation of the San Bruno explosion?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Did you consider that in your engagement?
- A. No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2.

2.5

Q. Exhibit 9 is a CAL FIRE May 25, 2018 news release about determining the cause of four wildfires in Butte and Nevada counties stating, among other things, in those bullet points that CAL FIRE has determined the fire was caused by tree branches falling onto PG&E power lines.

Did you consider that report in connection with your engagement?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I did not consider this report, no.

19 BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Exhibit 10 is a June 8, 2018 CAL FIRE news release dealing with the determination of the causes of 12 wildfires in 2017.
- Did you consider that in connection with your engagement?
 - A. I did not consider this report, no.

Q. Exhibit 11 is a PUC order instituting investigation and order to show cause, date of issuance December 14, 2018, dealing with, among other things, an allegation that PG&E's employees falsified locate-and-mark records dealing with underground excavations where utility lines were.

Did you consider that in your report?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I did not, no.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2.5

Q. Exhibit 12 is a probation officer report dated -- what's the date -- filed in the criminal action involving PG&E on January 9, 2019 dealing with whether or not the probation officer thought that PG&E had reported a settlement with the Butte County District Attorney's Office.

Did you consider that in connection with your engagement?

- A. I did not consider this, no.
- Q. Exhibit 13 is in order to show cause issued by Federal Judge Alsup on January 9, 2019 in the criminal action involving Pacific Gas and Electric, dealing with whether or not PG&E's conditions of probation should be modified.

Did you consider that in connection with

L	your	engagement?

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

2.3

24

2.5

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: No, I did not consider this document.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. So did anyone advise you or inform you that Federal Judge Alsup was considering imposing new conditions of probation dealing with imposing a wildfire mitigation plan on PG&E?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: No, not that I recall.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. And were you aware that Judge Alsup has issued an order stating that he is going to impose the new conditions on April 2, 2019?
 - A. No.
- Q. So did -- in your discussions with the compensation committee, did the compensation committee or you consider holding off on creating the wildfire safety metric in the 2019 metrics until finding out what wildfire safety metric Judge Alsup was going to impose on PG&E?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: No. The discussion was all

around -- that I was part of was around safety and importance of safety for the company and having an incentive plan that reinforced that.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Q. And if the federal judge imposes a safety metric totally different than the safety metric in that 10 percent in the 2019 metrics, do you think you would have to re-evaluate it?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: Well, the plan is a matter of the design. There is -- ultimately it's up to the compensation committee's discretion in terms of how the plan is adjudicated and paid over time. So I would assume that they would take any new information into account as they consider the payments.

Again, the plan is just a prospective plan. There's nothing guaranteed in the plan. So it's a matter of how the company performs against the metrics over the course of the year and quarters.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. And if the law changes on what the metrics should be, shouldn't they be changed?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: Again, I think that -- in cases that I'm -- in situations I'm involved in, the compensation committee again retains the discretion, as they do here, to make adjustments to the payouts that would be provided under the plan as new information is brought forth.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

- Q. Do you remember when the compensation committee approved the 2019 STIP?
 - A. I do.
 - Q. When?
- A. I believe it was at the January 23rd compensation committee meeting.
- Q. Did you do any work for PG&E with respect to the 2019 compensation STIP? Sorry. After January 23rd?
- A. Other than respond to questions that were posed to us, no.
 - Q. And who posed the questions to you?
- A. It would have been management posing questions.
- Q. What questions did management propose?
- MR. SLACK: So I'm going to instruct you to the

extent that there were communications that were -and questions that were done in connection with
litigation or the bankruptcy, as opposed to advising
the board, I would instruct you not to answer on the
grounds of privilege and work product.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. SLACK: Okay.

THE WITNESS: So would you repeat the question then, please.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

O. Yes.

What questions did management ask you, unless your counsel says counsel participated in the questioning?

MR. SLACK: No, that's not the instruction. That's not the instruction. The instruction is whether it's coming from management.

But if the design was to work with the lawyers in connection with the bankruptcy proceeding, such as this motion, for example, that's privileged and you shouldn't be discussing it.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

So with respect to the 2019 STIP, the questions that were posed post the 23rd, that I recall, really had to do with two modifications that

were made to the STIP prior -- sorry -- following the committee's approval on January 23rd.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

2.5

One was the inclusion of an individual performance modifier, and the second was to modify the target opportunities for certain individual -- I'm sorry -- certain participants in the 2019 STIP by increasing them by 25 percent of the target opportunities.

And the question was simply, we're contemplating doing this. What do you think? BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. And then did they do it?
- A. They did -- it's my understanding, yes, that they proceeded with those two modifications.
- Q. How was the individual performance modifier changed after January 23rd?
- A. The individual performance modifier in the 2019 STIP -- there actually was no individual performance modifier in the 2019 STIP as approved by the compensation committee on January 23rd.
- Q. So go to Exhibit 17, your declaration.

 And tell me where in your declaration you discuss the individual performance modifier.
- A. It is on page -- I think it's 10 -- or 6 of 10, I guess it is, in line 16.

And so, again, to -- what was approved on January 23rd did not have this provision.

- Q. Did management tell you why they made that change?
 - A. They did.

2.

2.2.

Historically the company had an individual performance component, "historically" meaning in the 2018 STIP. And, my understanding, in STIPs prior to that, there was an individual performance modifier.

My recommendation to them is -- back in early January -- January 23rd was they would not have an individual performance modifier. And so subsequent to that, management recommended that -- they felt it was important to reinstitute the individual modifier that they had historically.

- Q. Why did you suggest, in connection with the January 23rd approval, not to have an individual performance modifier?
- A. Because in a restructuring situation where there are many changes that are going on with the business, there's a significant amount of uncertainty, there's a lot of -- just a lot of uncertainty, what I have found is that it's much simpler, much less complex -- the majority have a lot of complexity happening -- to not have an

individual component, to say that everybody in this plan for this period of time is measured on the same basis; in this case, the 50 percent on safety, the 40 on financial, and the 10 on customer satisfaction.

2.

2.2.

And it just provides more clarity, more certainty during the restructuring period, more simplicity, which is good.

- Q. Okay. And where is the target opportunity for 25 percent? Same place?
 - A. No. Let's see. I'm looking to see . . .
- Q. The 25 percent change that you referred to a moment ago is not in the same paragraph, 4(b)?
- A. No, that was the -- for the 10 percent of the population that are viewed as high performers, they're eligible for an additional 25 percent award.

And in addition to that -- and let me see if it's referenced in here. Not recalling exactly where it's at. And I may not have actually mentioned it because it's not part of what we had looked at in terms of the opportunities. So I don't think it is referenced in here because, again, I wasn't commenting on the opportunity levels of participants.

Q. I think I'll come back to that.

1	A.	Okay
---	----	------

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. The debtors filed a motion for approval of 2018 STIP awards and then withdrew that motion in February, February 28.
- Did the debtors or Weil seek your advice on asking for approval or withdrawal of the 2018 STIP?
- MR. SLACK: So to the extent -- you can answer that question with respect to the company. You cannot answer that -- I would instruct you not to answer with respect to Weil.

THE WITNESS: So, no, the company did not seek our advice on whether or not to pay the 2018 STIP award.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. And did you discuss that topic with Weil? But don't tell me what was discussed.
- MR. SLACK: I'm going to instruct you not to answer the question.

20 BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Have you been retained by Weil as an expert witness?
- A. We have been retained by Weil. I don't know the designation of that only because I just don't know the legal designation versus -- I don't

know the legal designation . . . so I don't know.

- Q. Okay. Did anyone from the company explain to you why the company withdrew the request for bankruptcy court's approval of the 2018 STIP awards?
- A. It was discussed at the compensation committee meeting in February, February 19th. So they didn't explain it to me, but it was discussed at the compensation committee. And management made the recommendation. My recollection is just in respect to the restructuring, the management was recommending to make -- to recommend that decision.
- Q. What was discussed as to the reason why the recommendation was made?
- A. It was my recollection it was just that going through the restructuring process, they thought that was the right answer, given all that goes into the restructuring process.
 - Q. Did you have an opinion on it?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did you offer any advice with respect to the withdrawal?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- 23 THE WITNESS: No.
- 24 BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.5

Q. Did you offer any comments?

1 A. No.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Did you have a view as to whether or not the withdrawal of the 2018 STIP award request was prudent?
- A. No.
- Q. Did you advise the compensation committee whether or not they should investigate whether or not employees' work contributed to the San Bruno explosion?
- 10 A. I did not.
- 11 Q. Gas safety violations?
- 12 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- 13 THE WITNESS: I did not.
- 14 BY MR. JULIAN:
- Q. Obstruction of justice?
- 16 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- 17 THE WITNESS: I did not.
- 18 BY MR. JULIAN:
- 19 Q. 2015 Butte fire?
- 20 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- 21 THE WITNESS: No.
- 22 BY MR. JULIAN:
- Q. 2016 Ghost Ship fire?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- 25 THE WITNESS: No.

Page 52 BY MR. JULIAN: 1 2017 fires? 2. Q. 3 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form. THE WITNESS: No. 4 BY MR. JULIAN: 5 2018 fires? 6 Ο. MR. SLACK: Objection to the form. THE WITNESS: No. 8 9 BY MR. JULIAN: 10 Did the compensation committee change the 11 2018 STIP annual review and annual payment to a 12 quarterly review and payment? 13 Α. It did. Who proposed that? 14 Ο. I did. 15 Α. 16 And did you discuss it with the Ο. 17 compensation committee? I did. 18 Α. Did you discuss the reason? 19 Q. I did. 20 Α. 21 What did you discuss? Ο. 2.2 Α. That in my experience, given the uncertainty, the amount of external factors that 23 impact employees' engagement in the business and 24 making sure that they achieve the goals, which 25

ultimately we're trying to do -- that's what the incentive plan is for, to try to drive the performance -- that having shorter measurement periods that provide more close-in line of sight, i.e., quarterly, is appropriate to drive that.

Also the fact that in a structuring, non-annual incentives, whether it's quarterly, semi-annually, are common. In fact, the majority of plans in restructurings don't maintain an annual measurement period. They go to a different measurement period, most often quarterly.

Q. When you gave that advice, were you aware that CAL FIRE had said that PG&E's equipment caused the 2015 Butte fire?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know what CAL FIRE said, but, no, I wasn't aware of any reports of other entities.

BY MR. JULIAN:

2.

2.2.

Q. When you gave that advice, did you know that CAL FIRE's investigators determined that some of PG&E's equipment caused some of the 2017 fires?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Again, not knowing what CAL FIRE said, no. I wouldn't have --

2.

2.2.

Q. When you gave that advice, were you aware that PG&E's own officials believed that it was probable that their equipment in the Paradise area was the ignition point for the 2018 Camp fire?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Again, not knowing whether the individuals said all that or -- no, I didn't take that into account.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. So here's the problem for the tort committee: In the last four years, we have three fires which the officials in PG&E have said was caused by PG&E's equipment. And the tort committee believes there's a chance there could be another fire in 2019. And the 2017 fire was on October 8, the 2018 fire was on November 8, 2018.

And how do you respond to the criticism of the quarterly payments --

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. -- that three-fourths of the STIP awards could be out the door to the employees before finding out whether their work contributed to a

fourth fire in five years?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I think that -- again, this plan is a prospective plan, and the company has the ability to manage the payments throughout the period, whether or not they want to, as a committee, make the payments.

I also think there are other mechanisms to address any form of issues that may come up in terms of negative impacts on the company, whether that's terminating employees, performance plans, holding back compensation on a go-forward basis.

So the 2019 STIP is a single tool in the company's overall portfolio to align the behaviors and to reinforce the objective of the company.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. In this discussion on changing the annual STIP payment to a quarterly payment, was there any discussion at the compensation committee meetings that you attended about the wisdom or propriety of paying out the money before the company found out if there was going to be yet another fire in October/November of 2019?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

2.3

24

2.5

Q. Any discussion at all about that?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: There was discussion around the fact that there were going to be payments made throughout the year, in general, as a general matter, and the notion of so-called claw-backs, the phrase that people used, ability to claw back.

So, yes, there was discussion. And there was -- it was the balancing of providing back to -- certainty to employees there would be some payment coming out of this program with the potential that actions or outcomes could happen during the course of the year that may be counter to what they were trying to achieve.

Yes, there was discussion on that. BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. But my question was, did any director say the words, "There might be a fire in 2019. We should rethink that"?

Those words -- were those words said, that concept?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall any director

1 saying those exact words.

BY MR. JULIAN:

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Q. How about something like it?

MR. SLACK: Objection --

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Anything at all about the fires discussed?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: There was significant discussion around safety, and fire obviously is part of that.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Move to strike your answer. Not responsive.

MR. SLACK: You can't interrupt the witness.

So if you're done, you're done; it's fine.

But just because the questioner here doesn't like the answer, you're entitled to finish. So if you're

finished, great; if not, you should finish.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Go ahead, Mr. Friske.

A. So there -- again, there was significant discussion around safety and around how fire plays a role in -- fire mitigation plays in that and how that interacts with the incentive plan, the short-term incentive plan.

1	Q. Was there any discussion about the
2	possibility of a fire in October/November of 2019?
3	MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
4	THE WITNESS: There was a discussion about the
5	possibility of fire at any point in time and the
6	desire to make sure that that risk was
7	BY MR. JULIAN:
8	Q. What was said about that?
9	MR. SLACK: Objection.
LO	You know what, we're not twice
L1	you've I know you don't mean to, but because
L2	you're anxious, but there's twice that you've
L3	interrupted him.
L4	BY MR. JULIAN:
L5	Q. Go ahead and finish.
L6	MR. SLACK: What I would like to do is
L7	Do you need where you are in your answer
L 8	read back?
L9	THE WITNESS: Yes, please.
20	MR. SLACK: Can you read back where the witness
21	was in his answer. And read back the question also.
22	(Record read by reporter as follows:
23	"Question: Was there any discussion about
24	the possibility of a fire in
25	October/November of 2019?")

THE REPORTER: There was an objection.

(Record read by reporter as follows:

"Question: There was a discussion about the possibility of fire at any point in time and the desire to make sure that that risk was --")

THE WITNESS: Mitigated. Period.

BY MR. JULIAN:

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

- Q. What was the discussion on that point?
- A. That there needed to be significant emphasis placed on mitigating -- or safety across the board, but, in particular, fire mitigation.
- Q. Was there discussion about increasing the metric from 10 percent?
- A. I recall discussions around all the metric weightings. I don't recall specifically to that point, whether there was discussion.
- Q. Was there any discussion at the compensation committee level about giving greater weight to fire mitigation safety than financial performance?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

24 THE WITNESS: No, I don't recall that
25 discussion of those factors.

Page 60 MR. SLACK: So we're about an hour, and so it's 1 2 up to you. 3 MR. JULIAN: Good point. MR. SLACK: Good point? All right. Let's do 4 it. 5 (Recess taken.) 6 7 BY MR. JULIAN: Back on the record. 8 Q. 9 Mr. Friske, if you could turn to 10 Exhibit 2, to page WP 4-40 and -41, toward the end. 11 Α. Um-hum. 12 This is PG&E's description of the STIP 13 calculation for 2018. And on page WP 4-41, paragraph 4, there's a section on individual 14 15 employee STIP payments. 16 Do you see that? 17 Α. I do. And it says that "Leaders may modify 18 employee STIP payment based on his or her individual 19 20 performance." 21 Is that part of the 2019 plan? 2.2. Α. It is for up to 10 percent of the 23 population. So not everyone can have an adjustment. 24 Only 10 percent of the participants in the 2019

25

STIP.

- Q. What about the other 90 percent?
- A. They aren't eligible for any individual modifier.
 - Q. And what's the modifier for the 10 percent pool?
 - A. 25 percent adjustment to the calculated award.
 - Q. Upward?

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- A. Correct.
- Q. Is there any possibility for the individual personal performance modifier to go downward for 2019?
 - A. There is not.
 - Q. And that's a change from 2018; right?
 - A. Correct. But it's also a change, and it's only eligible for the top -- the highest performers, the top 10 percent performers.
 - Q. Under the 2018, was the individual performance modifier zero to 1.5?
 - A. I'm not sure what the individual modifier was in 2018, under the 2018 STIP.
 - Q. But under the 2018 STIP, the modifier could take the employee down to zero for the entire pool; right?
 - A. I don't know.

So what did you know about the performance 1 modifier for 2018 when you recommended the 2019 2. STIP? 3 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the 4 question. 5 THE WITNESS: That there was an individual 6 7 performance modifier. BY MR. JULIAN: 8 9 Did you know that the employee could be 10 taken to zero? MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the 11 12 question. 13 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know. They could have been. 14 15 BY MR. JULIAN: Whose idea was it to change the individual 16 performance modifier from 2018 to 2019? 17 In the originally proposed 2019 STIP? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. 20 Again, I had made that suggestion. Α. 21 Of what it should be? Ο. 2.2. Α. That there -- initial recommendation that

there would not be an individual performance

23

24

2.5

modifier.

0.

I see.

And they accepted that recommendation?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: That was what was approved by the committee at the January 23rd meeting, correct.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Subsequently, the committee changed it to have an upward modification for 10 percent of the pool?
- A. They agreed to have an upward modification for 10 percent of the participants, for up to 10 percent of the participants.
- Q. And who are the 10 percent of the participants?
- A. They're not -- it's going to be the highest performing individuals over the course of the period.
- Q. Who determines who the 10 percent of the pool will be?
- A. My understanding, they'll be nominated by their managers, and then senior management will determine who those individuals are ultimately.
 - Q. On a quarterly basis?
- A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

Q. Was there any discussion at the compensation committee level about having an

individual performance modifier to take into account an employee's culpability for prior disasters?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: At the compensation committee meetings, we had talked about not having a performance -- an individual performance modifier as part of the plan.

BY MR. JULIAN:

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

Q. Right.

Did anyone say that's not a good idea, some of these employees might have contributed to the prior disasters?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: They did not. There was a general discussion, again, of how the company -- this is a prospective plan, so there's always the ability to adjust an award at the end of a performance period.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. By who?
- A. By the compensation committee and management.
 - Q. Individual awards or classes of awards?

1 A. As far as I know, both.

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

2.5

- Q. Is there any metric given in the 2019 STIP for what the compensation committee would consider in reducing or eliminating an award?
- A. No. That's the purpose of discretion, that they can use their judgment to assess the conditions under which such a change would be made and then make a determination.
- Q. Is there any written metric in the STIP that governs the exercise of that judgment?
- A. No. It's unilaterally across the entire plan.
- Q. What do you mean by "unilaterally across the entire plan"?
- A. There's discretion across the entirety of the plan whether to pay anything out, to pay certain individuals out, to pay different metrics out. It's entirely a prospective discretionary plan. So that's what I mean, "unilaterally"; it's across all aspects of the plan.
- Q. Was there any discussion at the compensation committee level about how San Francisco union employees were included in the STIP plan?
 - A. Not that I recall.
 - Q. Was there any discussion at the

compensation committee level about whether there should be metrics to guide the compensation committee in determining whether to grant quarterly STIP awards?

- A. Are you referring to whether they used their discretion? I'm not sure, when you say "metrics to guide" whether they grant the awards --
 - Q. Yeah.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2.5

Other than discretion, was there any discussion at the compensation committee as to whether there should be metrics to guide the compensation committee members to exercise their discretion as to whether to grant quarterly awards?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: No. Because in my experience, that's the whole point of discretion. If you had metrics to guide it, then it's not discretion; it's driven by the metrics. The plan has metrics. The discretion is there to allow them to use their judgment outside the metrics that existed -- or exist.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. The financial performance metric was changed from 25 to 40 over 2019 [sic] to 2019; right?

1	7\	2018	2 + O	2019
	Α.	Z U 1 C		$\Delta U \perp \mathcal{I}$

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. What did I say?
- A. I think you said 2019 to 2019.
- O. Let me start over.

The financial performance metric weighting was changed from 25 percent in 2018 to 40 percent in 2019; is that right?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Was there any discussion at the compensation committee about putting the 15 percent on wildfire mitigation instead of financial performance?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall specific discussion around that. There's, again, general discussion about the various weights tied to the various metrics.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Which of your other clients have you recommended shifting from an annual payment to a quarterly payout?
- A. For companies in restructuring situations --
- 25 Q. Sure.

A. -- it would be virtually all of them. And it may not necessarily be just quarterly. Again, it depends on the circumstances. In some restructuring cases, there may be shorter time frames, so you'd recommend other time periods that align with the case.

2.

2.2.

Q. Is one of the reasons that you're in bankruptcy and you want to incentivize your employees to stay, and bankruptcy creates some uncertainty?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form the question.

THE WITNESS: I think it's really back to my point earlier, which was, in a bankruptcy, a year -- there's a lot of uncertainty that looks out over the course -- you incur over the course of a year.

And people are worried about the future of the organization. They're worried about their own roles. They're worried about whether they're going to get compensated or not. So by providing an incentive that has a shorter time horizon on it, you give them more certainty.

It allows them to focus on their job and achieving their objectives than whether or not they are going to have to wait a year to see if this gets paid. That's the primary reason.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Q. Do you think it was prudent to consider that uncertainty?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: To consider that uncertainty of what I just described in establishing the plan?

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Yes.
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Did you similarly consider the uncertainty of a fire in November of 2019 might make it imprudent to kick out incentive pay until you learn the employees had corrected the wildfire risk in California?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: So, again, I considered all of the various potential opportunities or potential issues that might happen to a company. Like in any situation, there are things that can happen, whether it's wildfire, whether it's global economic recession, whether it's regulatory changes.

In all of my restructuring work, there are the possibility of things that might happen during the course of the year. And that's a trade-off that I think I and companies of my clients have to make

1 in determining the balancing.

Do you get the positive benefits from having a quarterly payment versus the potential of some extraneous event happening that otherwise wasn't expected?

BY MR. JULIAN:

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

Q. Have you met anyone who lost their home in the 2017 or 2018 fires?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

11 THE WITNESS: I have not.

12 BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Anyone who lost their loved ones in those fires?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I have not.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Were any of your clients that were in bankruptcy that you gave this advice to from switching from an annual payment to a quarterly payment in the situation of this company where they were facing the threat of massive wildfires that create death and destruction in California?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the

question.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

THE WITNESS: Not that exact circumstance, but I've worked with a number of companies restructuring where there was -- again, there were potentials that negative things could happen, whether that's an airline that could have events that would be quite catastrophic that might happen in the course of a year, or a car manufacturer that might have issues with its products or other situations where things, again, may happen during the course of a given year that are unexpected and would have an impact on the business. Yes, in those circumstances.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Did any of those companies have State agency orders pending against them saying that their employees had willfully falsified the records?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of State orders relative to any of those situations or any form of State orders.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Take a look at Exhibit 14. This is PG&E's response to Judge Alsup's orders that he might impose conditions of probation dealing with wildfire

mitigation. And turn to page 48, line 8.

PG&E lawyers wrote, "Simply put, the resources required to comply with the proposed modifications do not exist. PG&E does not have the necessary funds. Were PG&E allowed to pass on the cost, the rate increases would be impressive.

Qualified labor shortage is even more problematic.

PG&E does not have, nor does it believe it could find the qualified personnel necessary to complete the proposed work."

Did you have any discussions with anyone at PG&E about PG&E's financial ability to comply with Judge Alsup's proposed conditions dealing with the wildfire mitigation?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I did not.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

- Q. Did you have any understanding at all as to where PG&E is going to get the money to pay the STIP awards?
- A. I assume from their operations, but beyond that, no. Most companies, in terms of their ongoing operations, should usually fund the incentive awards.
 - Q. Let's turn to Judge Alsup's order which

followed this PG&E brief. It's Exhibit 15. Turn to page 7. I would like you to read to yourself the entire paragraph, lines 14 through 27, and then tell me when you're finished and I'll have a couple of questions for you.

A. Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Witness reads document.)

- A. Okay. I've read it.
- Q. And do you have any opinion as to whether or not what Judge Alsup is paying there -- one of the things he's saying is PG&E should not put profitability before wildfire safety?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question. Lack of foundation.

THE WITNESS: Can you ask the question again, please.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Yes.

You're offered up as an expert in this case; right?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

23 BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. If you know. If you don't know, tell me you don't know.

A. Just repeat the questic	Α.	Just	repeat	the	question
----------------------------	----	------	--------	-----	----------

- Is your interpretation of this one of the Q. things Judge Alsup is saying is that PG&E should not put profit-making before wildfire safety?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the 6 question.

Yeah, I'm not, based on this THE WITNESS: paragraph, in a position to say what that judge was inferring.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

- And based upon what this judge is saying here, your interpretation of it, do you believe you should go back and advise the compensation committee to change the metric of financial performance from 40 percent to something lower?
 - MR. SLACK: Objection as to the form.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Are you inferring that this is an order directing the company to do anything in terms of its performance? Because it's not.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Ο. Go ahead. You may answer.
- Α. Repeat the question again.
- She'll repeat it. Ο.
- (Record read by reporter as follows:
- "Question: And based upon what this judge 25

is saying here, your interpretation of it, do you believe you should go back and advise the compensation committee to change the metric of financial performance from 40 percent to something lower?")

MR. SLACK: Objection.

And there's an objection, right, to the form?

THE REPORTER: Yes, there's an objection.

THE WITNESS: Based on my reading of this paragraph, there's nothing here that would have me go back and revise my recommendation.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Do you have any present intent to submit any further declarations in connection with STIP motion proceedings in the bankruptcy court?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. Okay. What's the largest incentive plan that you have ever advised on?
 - A. What is the largest incentive plan?
 - Q. I'm sorry.
 - Yeah, dollar amount of short-term --
 - A. How are you defining "incentive plans"?
- Q. Pardon me?
 - A. How are you defining "incentive plans"?

L	Q.	STIPs,	short-term	incentive	plans.

3 ever advised on?

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

A. In terms of the target opportunity that was provided to people?

What's the largest dollar amount you've

- O. Yes.
- A. Be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. I don't know the exact amount.
- Q. Have you advised on any STIP plans where a target goal was larger than 235 million?
- A. The target payout was larger than 235 million?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. I don't believe so in a restructuring. Outside of restructuring, potentially, but in a restructuring, not that I can recall.
- Q. Under the performance metrics and the multipliers that you have in this case for the 2019 STIP, what's the largest the amount of the STIP award could be above the \$235 million target?

21 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I believe it is 335 million approximately.

25 BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Have you ever been involved in a

 Chapter 11 case involved in that large of a dollar

 amount of STIP awards?
- A. I may have been. Not that I recall. This is also one of the largest cases that have been in place -- or that has been completed.
- Q. How was the customer satisfaction metric changed from 2018 to 2019?
 - A. I don't know.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

- Q. So if you go to Exhibit 2, to the 2018 structure, on page WP 4-39, you'll see there's this description of the customer weighting of 25 percent and the definition.
 - A. Um-hum.

(Witness reviews document.)

- Q. One thing you do remember is that the weighting was changed from 25 percent in 2018 to 10 percent in 2019; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Do you know if there were any other changes in how the metric is employed or gauged thereafter?
- A. I don't recall any of those changes. There may have been; I don't recall.
 - Q. What was the discussion at the

compensation committee about the reason of changing the customer satisfaction from 25 to 10 percent weighting?

- A. They were looking to have an increased weighting on the financial component and didn't feel that -- wanted to maintain the safety at 50 percent. So that meant that the customer would be the one area where they would take the percentages from.
- Q. Was there any discussion at the compensation committee about changing the weighting on wildfire mitigation for electrical from 10 percent to a higher number and taking it from some other metric?

MR. SLACK: I'm going to object to the form. It's asked and answered.

You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Not that I recall.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

- Q. Do you know whether or not PG&E has linked its 2019 STIP compensation metric to customer satisfaction in any particular way? Or is that a detail you didn't deal with?
- MR. SLACK: Object to the form.

24 THE WITNESS: It was -- a customer component is 25 the 10 percent. But beyond that, no, I didn't deal

with the details of exactly how the metric operated.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Did anyone tell you how the -- the determination of whether the 10 percent on wildfire mitigation and systems hardening is to be determined?
- A. It may have been discussed during discussions of the metrics, but wasn't discussed with me. It was between --
- Q. But your team didn't get involved in determining whether or not that was a reasonable metric in terms of the component of the metric. Not the percentage, but the component.
 - A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

Q. And in determining -- did you or your team get involved at all in advising PG&E as to the reasonableness of the weighting of 10 percent on the wildfire mitigation and system hardening?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: We did not.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Who did advise the committee on that --
- A. I don't know.
- Q. -- if you know? All right.
- How did -- let's talk about base pay.

Do you know how PG&E calculates its base pay for its employees?

- A. When you say "calculate," what do you mean?
 - Q. Terrible question.

In other words, do they go through a peer review process of whether the employees at certain levels -- what they get through their peers?

Do you know how any of that is set?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Did your team do any evaluation of whether the base pay for the 10,000 employees were set at the peers?
 - A. My team did not.
- Q. And do you have any opinion as to whether or not the base pay of the 10,000 PG&E employees who were subject to the STIP awards is at market?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I have not done an analysis of that, no.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Did you do any analysis to determine whether or not the base pay plus the target STIP

awards to the 10,000-employee pool was at market,

below market, above market or at market?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: So, again, my team did not do any analysis of that.

(Tort Committee Exhibit 19 was marked.)

BY MR. JULIAN:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Let me show you Exhibit 19.
- MS. WOLTERING: It's in his binder.
- 10 MR. JULIAN: Not in my binder. How about
- 11 | counsel? Does counsel have it?
- MR. SLACK: I have it. Do you have an extra copy?
- MS. WOLTERING: No, there's one in each of the binders.

16 BY MR. JULTAN:

- Q. So for the record, Mr. Friske, I've handed you Exhibit 19, which is a copy of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's wildfire mitigation plan filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California. It's dated February 6, 2019.
- Your work, as I understand it, ended pretty much on January 23, 2019?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say that. I think the

substance of our analysis was done, but as I had mentioned, we provided some input. We participated in the compensation committee meeting on the 19th and then the subsequent questions, et cetera.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

O. Got it.

Then let me ask you: Did you or your team consider Pacific Gas' wildfire mitigation plan in a written form in any draft or final version?

- A. We did not.
- Q. And Exhibit 19, you've never seen that before; is that right?
- A. I don't believe so, no.
- MR. JULIAN: Do you want to take a little break so I can wrap up?
 - MR. SLACK: Sure. Are you going to be switching or not?
- MR. JULIAN: No. Done all that. Which eliminated a lot of the questions, by the way.
- 20 (Recess taken.)
- 21 BY MR. JULIAN:
- Q. We're back on the record.
- Mr. Friske, I would like to turn to your declaration, Exhibit 17.
- Who drafted it, your declaration?

- A. We worked with Weil to draft it.
- Q. Who did the first draft?
- A. Weil did, at my instructions. Because I
 had prepared other drafts before and I said, well,
 rather than just create it, I would use this
 version -- a prior version as a shell.
 - Q. Did you revise it some?
 - A. I'm sorry?
 - Q. Did you revise the declaration some?
- 10 A. Significantly.
- Q. And then you approved it before signing
- 12 it?

1

8

9

- 13 A. I did.
- Q. So let's go to page 5, Section C, "Summary of 2019 STIP."
- 16 A. Okay.
- Q. The first section there identifies the
- 18 2019 STIP participants; right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And Section 2 is "Implementation
- 21 | Performance Period"?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Section 3 is "Total Client Costs"?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. I see -- apologize. I didn't mean to

1 mislead you.

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

- A. I'm sorry.
- Q. The maximum aggregate payout is 350 million; is that right?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. Not 335 --
 - A. Not 335. I saw the 235 and --
 - Q. Good quess.

Section 4 is "2019 STIP Awards," that's a correct description of the award range, et cetera?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And Section 5 on the next page is "Performance Metrics and Weighting."
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. That's also part of the 2019 STIP?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. And then on the next page, you say that your firm -- "WTW has reviewed the terms and provisions of the 2019 STIP and believes that the structure, performance metrics and design and range of potential 2019 STIP awards are consistent with the debtors' industry with the only material difference in design being quarterly payments which, however, are very common in companies undergoing a restructure."

Page 85 Correct? 1 2. Α. Yes. Ο. Is that still true? 3 Yes. Α. 4 Did you advise SoCalGas, San Diego Gas and 5 Ο. Electric? 6 Α. No. Did your company advise them? 8 9 Α. They may -- well, on what matters? They may have. I don't know. 10 11 Let's look at Exhibit 19 -- no. 20. Q. 12 I don't think --Α. 13 MS. WOLTERING: Right here. (Tort Committee Exhibit 20 was marked.) 14 15 BY MR. JULIAN: 16 So go to page DSR 5. Q. 17 Α. Okay. On line 16, it states that "Both SoCalGas 18 and San Diego Gas and Electric have increased the 19 20 weighting of their safety measurements in variable 21 pay plans over the past two years such that safety 2.2. measures now comprise 70 percent of the company 23 performance component." Did you consider San Diego Gas' metric in 24 that regard in advising PG&E's compensation 25

1 | committee on --

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

3 BY MR. JULIAN:

2.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

Q. -- on the weighting of the safety factor for PG&E's 2019 STIP?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: No, I did not consider SDG&E's incentive plan.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. If you turn the page to DSR 6, it says that WTW there did the study with respect to compensation.

Does that refresh your recollection as to whether WTW was engaged by San Diego Gas and Electric?

- A. Well, WTW is a fairly large firm. We're engaged by many organizations that I'm not familiar with, but, yes, it refreshes -- it says it here, but there are many companies I don't know we work with.
- Q. In trying to obtain comparables for PG&E's safety metrics, did you ask anyone within WTW for similar metrics from other utilities that WTW advised?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question. Foundation.

THE WITNESS: I did reach out to our -- to individuals who consult in the utilities space for information with respect to common incentive practices, but I did not specify those companies being ones in which Willis Towers Watson does work.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. And did you review the performance metrics for reasonableness?
 - A. Can you define "metrics." Which are --
- Q. Oh, did you advise the compensation committee on the reasonableness of the performance metrics for PG&E's 2019 STIP?
- A. So I advised them on the three primary categories; so the fact of safety, financial and customer metrics. And it was reasonable to have those three categories and the weightings attached to those categories.
- Q. So if you go back to page 4 of your declaration --

Apologize.

A. Um-hum.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

Q. -- on line 7, Mr. Friske, you testified that, "Among other things, my team and I provided input and advice on the design and structure of the 2019 STIP for reasonableness."

Is it true what you were referring to there with respect to performance metrics was what you just said and nothing more?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: So with respect to metrics, it was the reasonableness of those three categories.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. And the reasonableness of those three categories dealt with what?
- A. Whether or not it was reasonable to have, as part of the 2019 STIP, a safety metric -- or safety -- class of safety metrics, a financial component and a customer component. Having those as the components of the incentive plan, whether or not that was reasonable.
- Q. Okay. Then, secondly, did you advise the committee as to whether the percentages of weighting for each of those three categories was reasonable?
 - A. I did.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

2.5

- Q. And then, third, did you advise the compensation committee with respect to whether the individual weightings in each subclass of safety and the like were reasonable?
 - A. I did not.
 - Q. So, for example, is it true you did not

advise the compensation committee as to whether or not the 10 percent weighting for wildfire mitigation and system hardening was reasonable?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: That is correct.

BY MR. JULIAN:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

- Q. What you did do is you advised the committee that 50 percent weighting for safety as a whole was reasonable?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And you did not consider San Diego Gas and Electric's 70 percent weighting in that regard; correct?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

16 THE WITNESS: That is correct.

17 BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Now, the last topic I want to get to -and whenever a lawyer says "last topic," you always
 have to wonder whether it really is, but I'm going
 to try to stick to it. I want to go back over this
 quarterly versus annual payment topic. Okay.
- I want to understand your testimony. And I don't want you to repeat everything, but I want to focus on something.

Does part of your advice switching from annual to quarterly have to do with retention?

- A. Any incentive plan, although the primary purpose of incentive is incenting, has a retentive component.
- Q. For the laymen, you don't want people or employees, while the company is in bankruptcy, leaving on the spur of the moment, or at any time?

 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

 BY MR. JULIAN:
 - Q. Fair enough?

2.

- A. I think that, in general, any entity wants to retain its employees in any situation. And so there are various mechanisms to do that; incentive plans, corporate culture.
- Q. In your opinion, is there any harm to the company that would come from waiting for Judge Alsup's April 2, 2019 decision about what type of wildfire mitigation requirements he's going to impose on PG&E vis-a-vis retaining employees?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: Since I'm not familiar with that -- other than what we've talked about during this discussion, I'm not familiar with the judge's

view.

2.

2.2.

I will say that there is harm towards continuing to have uncertainty -- I believe there's harm to continuing to have uncertainty around this plan and having employees unsure of whether or not there's going to be an incentive plan in place for them.

And the harm is that you have employees who are disengaged, who don't feel valued, who potentially could look for other opportunities. And so that, I think, is the harm of not having a plan that's in place.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. If you had a 2019 annual incentive plan with annual payments and annual reviews, do you think that would provide the employees with the comfort that they need?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: I can't speak to what comfort any individual employee would need. I can say, though, there is a spectrum of -- back to my point of wanting to ensure people feel that they're paid appropriately, that they're incented, that they're being awarded for their activities that they're accomplishing and they're all aligned with the

company's goals.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

And there's a spectrum of -- having no plan, having nothing is I think the least helpful in that regard. I think that a quarterly plan in this situation would be the most helpful in that regard. I think an annual plan would be better than no plan, but I don't think it would be as effective as a quarterly plan.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Do you think the presence of a bankruptcy court order approving some \$5 billion of debtor-in-possession financing could counterbalance your concern that the employees might be concerned about not having a quarterly payment plan in place?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

the broad-based employees aren't familiar with terms like "debtor-in-possession financing" and what assurances that can provide them as employees. They're concerned about what their paycheck is going to look like in two weeks, in three weeks, in a month or two.

THE WITNESS: In my experience, employees of --

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. In advising the compensation committee,

did you talk to any employees to find out their views on the short-term incentive plan?

- A. Other than management employees that we were discussing overall -- the overall program with, no.
- Q. Did you look at any surveys of the PG&E employees to see what they thought about the bankruptcy?
- A. I did not. I don't know if those exist, but, no, I did not look to see if they do exist.
- Q. Did you look at any surveys of employee views on the STIP itself?
 - A. I did not.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

Q. If you could, turn to Exhibit 1. This is the corrected declaration of Dinyar Mistry. And go to page 4 of his declaration, line 12.

Mr. Mistry testified, "In light of the 2018 Northern California wildfires and the material deterioration in the debtors' financial situation, the board of directors adopted senior management's recommendation and exercised its discretion to forego paying to approximately 11,000 of the debtors' employees the 2018 STIP awards, and the debtors withdrew the request for authority to pay such awards."

Do you know anything about that other than what you've testified in your deposition so far today?

A. I do not.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

Q. Do you know of any change in the debtors' view of its compensation plans between January 23, 2019, when the compensation committee approved the 2019 STIP, and February 28, 2019, when the debtors withdrew their motion to approve the 2018 awards?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Could you restate the question. Trying to get the dates.

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. So let's get something straight.

 January 23, 2019 the comp committee approves the 2019 STIP; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. At that time, you thought the debtors were going to put forward the 2018 STIP in court; right?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. That's what had been communicated, yes.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. And then I'm told, according to my trusty assistants, that on February 28, 2019, the debtors

withdrew their request to have the 2018 STIP approved; right?

So roughly one month between the two.

A. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.4

- Q. And my question is, you probably know where I'm going with this, but do you know of any change in the debtors' compensation committee's views on STIP awards that took place in the interim period?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: The only thing that I'm aware of is that at the February 19th compensation committee meeting, there was a discussion whereby management proposed that this was -- they were recommending this action. And then the committee had relayed that they understood the rationale behind that. And that was it. That's the only additional piece of information between those two dates that I'm aware of.

- 21 BY MR. JULIAN:
- Q. And the management that proposed that was Mr. Simon?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. The acting or interim CEO?

A. That's my understanding, yes.

- Q. And you mentioned -- you said the committee "understood the rationale," is what you said.
 - A. Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. What indicated to you that the committee understood the rationale?
- A. I don't recall the exact words, but there was general concurrence that they understood why they would be recommending that.
- Q. And what did Mr. Simon say the rationale was?
- A. My recollection was that it was largely related to the restructuring. I don't recall any other details beyond that.
 - O. You didn't ask?
 - A. I didn't ask?
 - Q. Did you ask?
 - A. No, I didn't ask.
- 20 MR. SLACK: Objection to the form.
- 21 BY MR. JULIAN:
- Q. What was your understanding of what he meant when he said it had to do with the restructuring?
- MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the

question.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

THE WITNESS: My understanding, as I said, was that given that there was -- the company was going through this restructuring process, that management had made the determination that it was in the best interests of all the stakeholders not to make those payments.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. Would the same hold true for the 2019 STIP?

MR. SLACK: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I think the 2019 STIP is a completely different situation. We're now looking on a prospective basis. Again, the 2019 STIP does not guarantee any payments. The 2019 STIP lays out a framework upon which to align the interests of all the participants with those at the company and the stakeholders.

Whether at the end of 2019 there are payments that are being made, discretion that's being applied, that's all to be determined. And to me it's separate from what happened in 2018.

BY MR. JULIAN:

Q. You just said -- I want you to listen to

your answer when the court reporter reads it back.

MR. JULIAN: Slowly.

(Record read by reporter as follows:

"Answer: I think the 2019 STIP is a completely different situation. We're now looking on a prospective basis. Again, the 2019 STIP does not guarantee any payments. The 2019 STIP lays out a framework upon which to align the interests of all the participants with those at the company and the stakeholders. "Whether at the end of 2019 there are payments that are being made, discretion that's being applied, that's all to be determined. And to me it's separate from what happened in 2018.")

BY MR. JULIAN:

- Q. Did you mean to say 2019?
- 19 MR. SLACK: Object to the form of the question.
- 20 THE WITNESS: No.
- 21 BY MR. JULIAN:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.2.

- Q. So you're happy with your answer?
- A. I think so.
- Q. Okay. One of the things you said is,
- "Whether at the end of 2019, there are payments that

1 are being made."

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You're referring to an annual program there; right?

- A. No. I meant payments throughout the year. I just meant, at the end, you'll know that over the course of that year -- whether payments have been made quarterly. So, no, I wasn't referring to an annual plan.
 - Q. Freudian slip.

You said, "The 2019 STIP lays out a framework upon which to align the interests of all the interests [sic] with the company and the stakeholders."

Do you include the tort claimants as one of the stakeholders?

A. I think so. In the sense that -- look at the plan. Especially if the company continues to focus on safety, continues to focus on the financial performance of the company and customer -- I think all of those, in my view, will lead to having the strongest value for all the constituents. So it's a yes.

MR. JULIAN: Thank you. Thanks for your time today.

I'll pass the witness.

1 MR. DENNY: No questions today from the 2 committee.

MR. SLACK: Okay.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

2.5

MR. JULIAN: Can you make changes to the deposition transcript by next week?

MR. SLACK: When you say "make changes" --

MR. JULIAN: Well, if he has any changes, in other words. Can he sign it before we file our brief, or are you --

MR. SLACK: I doubt I'm going to have him sign it before then, but I will --

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. SINGH: Are we going to designate the transcript confidential again?

MR. SLACK: Yes. Thank you.

We're going to designate the transcript as professional eyes only under the agreement that we have with both the tort committee and the UCC. And as we said the last time, we're happy to work with both committees, if we need to, and we'll find a mechanism for filings and the hearings.

So thank you.

MR. JULIAN: I want to use the whole transcript of both depositions and all the exhibits, so I think we can't seal any of it. So if you want to have a

hearing with the judge next week, let me know. 1 MR. SLACK: I'm sorry. I don't understand what 2. 3 you're saying. MR. JULIAN: I'm going to use everything. I 4 don't agree that it's confidential. 5 deposition. I don't think the NDA's deal with 6 7 depositions. But we have disagreement, so let's talk about having a phone conversation with Judge 8 9 Montali. Okay? 10 Is that agreeable? 11 MR. SLACK: I don't agree with you. We'll 12 agree to disagree right now, but we're happy to have 13 a discussion and work with you to try to work out our differences. 14 15 MR. JULIAN: Okay. Thanks. 16 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded 17 at 3:17 p.m.) 18 ---000---19 20 21 2.2. 23 24

25

1

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITION OFFICER

2.2

21

23 24

2.5

I, ANRAE WIMBERLEY, CSR NO. 7778, duly authorized to administer oaths pursuant to Section 8211 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, hereby certify that the witness in the foregoing deposition was by me sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the within-entitled cause; that said deposition was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witness was reported by me and was thereafter transcribed by me or under my direction by means of computer-aided transcription; that the foregoing is a full, complete and true record of said testimony; and that the witness was given an opportunity to read and correct said deposition and to subscribe same.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing deposition and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed by my hand this 22nd day of March, 2019.

Anna Whimberley

ANRAE WIMBERLEY

Entered: 03/28/19 16:34:1688 Page 3376

	Page 103
1	Veritext Legal Solutions
	1100 Superior Ave
2	Suite 1820
	Cleveland, Ohio 44114
3	Phone: 216-523-1313
4	
	March 22, 2019
5	
	To: Richard W. Slack, Esq.
6	
	Case Name: PG&E Corporation v. Pacific Gas And Electric Company
7	
	Veritext Reference Number: 3264070
8	
	Witness: Douglas Friske Deposition Date: 3/21/2019
9	
10	Dear Sir/Madam:
11	
	Enclosed please find a deposition transcript. Please have the witness
12	
	review the transcript and note any changes or corrections on the
13	
1 4	included errata sheet, indicating the page, line number, change, and
14	the magnetic for the change . However, the witness of circumstance material and
15	the reason for the change. Have the witness' signature notarized and
13	forward the completed page(s) back to us at the Production address
16	shown
17	above, or email to production-midwest@veritext.com.
18	above, of email to production mrawesteverreeke.com.
	If the errata is not returned within thirty days of your receipt of
19	11 one offered to hoo fooding within one of adapt of food fooding of
-	this letter, the reading and signing will be deemed waived.
20	,
21	Sincerely,
22	Production Department
23	
24	
25	NO NOTARY REQUIRED IN CA

Page 104 DEPOSITION REVIEW 1 CERTIFICATION OF WITNESS 2 ASSIGNMENT REFERENCE NO: 3264070 CASE NAME: PG&E Corporation v. Pacific Gas And Electric Company 3 DATE OF DEPOSITION: 3/21/2019 4 WITNESS' NAME: Douglas Friske In accordance with the Rules of Civil 5 Procedure, I have read the entire transcript of my testimony or it has been read to me. 6 I have made no changes to the testimony as transcribed by the court reporter. 8 Douglas Friske 9 Date 10 Sworn to and subscribed before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and County, the referenced witness did personally appear 11 and acknowledge that: 12 They have read the transcript; 13 They signed the foregoing Sworn Statement; and Their execution of this Statement is of 14 their free act and deed. 15 I have affixed my name and official seal 16 this _____, 20____, 17 Notary Public 18 19 Commission Expiration Date 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 105 DEPOSITION REVIEW 1 CERTIFICATION OF WITNESS 2 ASSIGNMENT REFERENCE NO: 3264070 CASE NAME: PG&E Corporation v. Pacific Gas And Electric Company 3 DATE OF DEPOSITION: 3/21/2019 WITNESS' NAME: Douglas Friske 4 In accordance with the Rules of Civil 5 Procedure, I have read the entire transcript of my testimony or it has been read to me. 6 7 I have listed my changes on the attached Errata Sheet, listing page and line numbers as 8 well as the reason(s) for the change(s). 9 I request that these changes be entered as part of the record of my testimony. 10 I have executed the Errata Sheet, as well as this Certificate, and request and authorize 11 that both be appended to the transcript of my testimony and be incorporated therein. 12 13 Date Douglas Friske 14 Sworn to and subscribed before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and County, 15 the referenced witness did personally appear and acknowledge that: 16 They have read the transcript; 17 They have listed all of their corrections in the appended Errata Sheet; 18 They signed the foregoing Sworn 19 Statement; and Their execution of this Statement is of their free act and deed. 20 I have affixed my name and official seal 21 this _____, 20____, 22 23 Notary Public 24 25 Commission Expiration Date

			Page	~ I
	Ι	ERRATA SHEET		
	VERITEXT I	LEGAL SOLUTION	NS MIDWEST	
	ASSIGN	NMENT NO: 3/2	1/2019	
PAGE/LIN	E(S) /	CHANGE	/REASON	
Date		Douglas 1		
			ME THIS	
DAY OF _			, 20	
	Notary	Public		

[& - 4-40] Page 1

	4.40.00000	44 11 17 17 27	40.10.10.00
&	1:12 2:20 8:2	44:11,17 45:23	48:12,16 61:6
& 2:18 3:3,10	2	46:6,18,19 54:16	66:24 67:6 77:12
1	2 15:10 21:1 28:13	55:14,24 56:19	77:17 78:2
1 28:11 93:14	42:15 60:10 77:10	58:2,25 60:21,24	257-7751 3:22
1.5 61:19	83:20 90:18	61:12 62:2,17,18	26/27 14:15
1.5 61:19 10 14:8 21:12	20 6:12 85:11,14	65:2 66:24,24	261 6:15
	104:16 105:22	67:1,3,3,7 69:11	27 6:17,22 73:3
40:20 43:7 46:24	106:22	76:18 77:8,18	28 21:6 38:23 49:4
46:25 48:4,14	200 20:3	78:20 81:21,23	94:8,25
59:14 60:22,24	2001 38:15	83:15,18 84:9,15	2800 2:19
61:4,17 63:7,10,11	201 4:17	84:19,21 86:5	3
63:12,17 77:18	2015 51:19 53:14	87:12,25 88:11	3 14:14 38:4,5
78:2,12,25 79:4,17	2016 38:23 51:23	90:18 91:14 94:7	83:23
89:2	2017 15:12 27:17	94:8,8,15,16,25	3/21/2019 103:8
10,000 80:14,18	40:22 52:2 53:22	97:9,13,15,16,20	104:3 105:3 106:2
81:1	54:16 70:8	98:4,7,8,12,18,25	3264070 1:25
100 3:5	2018 15:12 17:5,7	99:10 102:22	103:7 104:2 105:2
10111 3:13	17:12,17 18:8	103:4	335 76:23 84:6,7
11 1:8 2:8 22:16	19:22,23 21:6,8	2029 4:5	33rd 4:5
38:16 41:1 77:2	22:2 23:2,7,15,21	208-6436 3:7	34 15:16
11,000 93:22	24:6,11 27:10	21 1:17 2:21 6:17	35 26:9
1100 103:1	28:20 37:2 40:8	8:1 26:25 27:1,7	350 84:4
1160 3:5	40:20 41:3 47:8	27:23,24 28:1,7	38 21:5
12 40:22 41:11	49:3,6,13 50:4	36:10	39 21:5
93:16	51:3 52:6,11 54:5	212 3:22	3900 3:20
13 38:15 41:20	54:17,17 60:13	213 4:7	3:17 2:21 101:17
14 41:3 71:23 73:3	61:14,18,21,21,22	216-523-1313	
15 67:10 73:1	62:2,17 67:1,6	103:3	4
15-08-019 27:12	70:8 77:8,10,17	22 6:22 26:25 27:1	4 15:16 18:15
150,000 9:21	93:18,23 94:9,19	27:13 28:4,24	19:13 21:3 30:8
16 7:3 46:25 85:18	95:1 97:23 98:16	36:10 103:4	34:7 38:7,13
16617 102:24	2019 1:17 2:21 8:1	22nd 102:22	48:13 60:14 84:9
17 8:14 13:24	8:20 10:11 11:5	23 81:23 94:6,15	87:18 93:16
16:25 46:21 82:24	11:15 16:10,18,21	235 76:10,12,20	4-34 15:13,16,18
182 6:10	18:19 19:17 20:16	84:7	4-35 15:22
1820 103:2	22:3,6,17 23:2,7	23rd 44:14,18	4-36 15:24
19 6:8 29:3 81:6,8	23:15,21 24:6,12	45:24 46:2,16,20	4-37 16:1
81:18 82:11 85:11	28:11 33:19 34:13	47:2,11,17 63:4	4-38 16:3
19th 50:6 82:3	34:22 35:6 36:11	25 21:13,15 24:10	4-39 16:5 77:11
95:13		25:16,18,24 26:2	4-40 16:7 60:10
	37:3,9,12 41:13,21	40:8 46:7 48:10	
	42:15,20 43:7		

[4-41 - answered] Page 2

4.41 (0.12	002 2020 4 10	10 10 4 1 40 14	1 1 27 (57 20
4-41 60:13	802-3020 4:19	adjudicated 43:14	ahead 27:6 57:20
40 24:11 26:3,12	81 6:8	adjust 64:19	58:15 74:21
30:18 48:4 66:24	8211 102:4	adjustment 60:23	aided 102:12
67:6 74:15 75:5	85 6:12	61:6	airline 71:6
41 16:7 60:10	9	adjustments 30:11	align 55:15 68:5
42 6:25	9 6:20 40:8 41:13	44:6	97:17 98:9 99:11
434 15:15	41:21	administer 102:3	aligned 23:17
44114 103:2	90 61:1	administered 1:9	91:25
45 3:12 14:10	90067-3019 4:6	2:9	allegation 41:4
462-2677 3:14	94065-1134 4:18	adopted 31:19	allow 66:19
48 72:1	94104 2:20	93:20	allowed 72:5
49 7:3	94111 3:6	adoption 33:25	allows 68:22
5		advice 10:15,20	alsup 41:21 42:7
5 18:15 19:13 22:8	a	49:5,13 50:20	42:13,21 73:10
22:9 27:10 38:19	ability 55:6 56:8	53:12,20 54:2	74:3
83:14 84:12 85:16	64:19 72:12	70:20 87:24 90:1	alsup's 71:24
92:11	absence 22:16	advise 33:15,17	72:13,25 90:18
50 21:14 23:8,16	accepted 63:1	37:8,13,22 42:6	amount 9:19
24:2 48:3 78:6	accomplishing	51:6 74:13 75:3	47:21 52:23 75:22
89:8	91:25	79:22 85:5,8	76:2,8,19 77:3
500 3:20	account 43:16	87:10 88:16,20	analyses 9:25
	54:9 64:1	89:1	analysis 80:21,24
6	achieve 37:24	advised 37:21	81:5 82:1
6 38:23 46:24	52:25 56:15	75:19 76:3,9	angeles 4:6
81:21 86:10	achieving 68:23	86:23 87:13 89:7	annual 19:24,25
60661 3:21	acknowledge	advising 45:3	52:11,11 53:7,9
614 3:14	104:11 105:16	79:16 85:25 92:25	55:18 67:21 70:21
628 3:7	act 104:14 105:20	advisor 3:17 5:6	89:22 90:2 91:14
650 4:19	acting 95:25	advisors 14:21	91:15,15 92:6
7	action 41:13,22	17:8 18:4,11	99:2,8
7 20:17 39:3 73:2	95:16	affixed 104:15	annually 53:8
87:22	actions 39:19	105:21	anrae 1:23 2:22
70 85:22 89:12	56:13	agency 71:15	102:2,25
703-9980 4:7	activities 91:24	aggregate 11:11	answer 7:1 21:25
7778 1:24 2:23	addition 11:23	84:3	22:19 25:3 45:4
102:2	19:1 48:17	ago 48:13	49:8,10,11,19
	additional 48:16	agree 101:5,11,12	50:16 57:12,17
8	95:18	agreeable 101:10	58:17,21 74:21
8 6:3 27:17 39:8	address 22:15	agreed 63:9	78:16 98:1,4,22
40:20 54:16,17	55:10 103:15	agreement 100:17	answered 37:19
72:1			78:15

[anxious - ca] Page 3

	20.467.20	71 10 05 10 10	75.076.14.00
anxious 58:12	aspects 20:4 65:20	71:19 95:12,19	75:2 76:14,23
anybody 26:1	assess 65:6	b	82:13 91:3
apologize 83:25	assessment 6:22	b 6:5 48:13	believed 54:3
87:20	27:14	back 16:24 21:1	believes 54:15
appear 104:11	assignment 104:2	21:16 22:8 47:10	84:19
105:15	105:2 106:2	48:25 55:13 56:8	benefits 6:14
appearances 3:1	assistance 19:15	56:10 58:18,20,21	24:21 70:2
appended 105:11	19:20	60:8 68:12 74:13	best 97:5
105:18	assistants 94:25	75:2,12 82:22	better 92:6
applicable 25:1,5	assisting 10:10	87:18 89:21 91:21	beyond 18:7 20:22
applied 19:23 23:9	associated 22:15	98:1 103:15	23:24 34:5 72:21
97:22 98:14	assume 43:15	background 15:2	78:25 96:15
appreciate 20:23	72:21	backs 56:7	billing 11:12,12
appropriate 19:7	assurances 92:20	baker 3:3,10	billion 92:11
19:11 36:16,20	attached 87:16	bakerlaw.com 3:8	binder 81:9,10
53:5	105:7	3:15	binders 81:15
appropriately	attended 55:21	balancing 56:10	bmurphy 3:23
91:23	attorney 102:18	70:1	board 9:10 12:10
appropriateness	attorney's 41:16	bankruptcy 1:1,6	45:4 59:12 93:20
30:9,17	auditing 36:5	2:1,6 25:2,5 45:3	board's 40:1
approval 8:16	audits 26:14	45:19 50:4 68:8,9	bonus 10:16
46:2 47:17 49:2,6	authority 93:24	68:13 70:20 75:16	bottom 29:4
50:4	authorize 105:11	90:7 92:10 93:8	bpr 33:24 34:3
approve 94:9	authorized 102:3	base 24:24 79:25	branches 40:13
approved 44:11	authorizing 38:14	80:1,14,18,25	break 82:14
46:19 47:1 63:3	ave 103:1	based 9:18 11:12	brendan 3:19
83:11 94:7 95:2	award 48:16 49:14	12:25 29:22 60:19	brief 73:1 100:9
approves 94:16	51:3 61:7 64:19		broad 37:10 92:18
approving 92:11	65:4 76:20 84:10	74:7,11,25 75:10	brought 39:9 44:8
approximately	awarded 91:24	92:18 baseline 21:1	bruno 39:10,15
76:24 93:22	awards 11:20		40:2 51:8
april 38:23 42:15	22:15 49:3 50:4	basis 9:18 35:5,8	bullet 40:11
90:18	54:23 64:25,25	48:3 55:13 63:22	business 17:3
area 13:4 54:4	66:4,7,13 72:20,24	97:15 98:6	37:25 47:21 52:24
78:8	77:3 80:19 81:1	battery 3:5	71:12
arguably 25:3	84:9,21 93:23,25	beginning 2:20	butte 38:25 40:10
arising 39:9	94:9 95:8	26:10 28:19	41:15 51:19 53:14
asked 33:3 35:4	aware 26:21 28:3	behalf 9:13	c
37:19 78:15	28:6 32:5,15 38:6	behaviors 55:15	
asking 49:6	39:13,19,24 42:13	believe 27:25	c 83:14
0	53:12,17 54:2	33:21 36:9,13	ca 103:25
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	44:14 72:8 74:12	

[cal - company] Page 4

cal 38:23 40:8,12	ceo 95:25	circumstances	33:15 37:8 42:18
40:20 53:13,16,21	certain 46:5,6	68:3 71:12	42:19 44:5,11,15
53:24	65:16 80:7	civil 102:4 104:5	46:20 50:6,8 51:6
calculate 80:3	certainty 48:7	105:5	52:10,17 54:12,14
calculated 61:6	56:11 68:21	claimants 99:14	55:7,20 59:19
calculates 80:1	certificate 102:1	clarity 48:6	63:4,6,25 64:5,23
calculation 60:13	105:11	class 37:4 88:12	65:3,22 66:1,3,10
california 1:2 2:2	certification 104:1	classes 64:25	66:12 67:10 74:13
2:20 3:6 4:6,18	105:1	classic 14:8	75:3 78:1,10
8:1 27:12,16	certified 2:22 8:5	claw 56:7,8	79:22 81:6 82:3
69:14 70:24 81:21	certify 102:5,17	clear 9:15	85:14 86:1 87:11
93:18 102:4	cetera 82:4 84:10	clearing 21:13	88:17,21 89:1,8
called 56:7	chain 38:19 39:3	cleveland 103:2	92:25 94:7,15
camp 54:5	chair 12:8	client 83:23	95:13,16 96:3,6
cap 29:22	chairman 12:10	clients 67:20 69:25	100:2,18
caption 102:19,21	chance 54:15	70:19	committee's 13:7
car 71:8	change 47:4 48:12	close 26:2,7,7 53:4	43:13 46:2 95:7
caribou 38:20	52:10 61:14,15	code 102:4	committees
39:4	62:16 65:7 74:14	colleagues 15:9	100:20
case 1:6,7,8 2:6,7	75:4 94:5 95:7	come 48:25 55:10	common 31:3,10
2:8 8:20 39:9 48:3	103:13,14 105:8	90:17	31:10,11,14 37:6
68:6 73:20 76:18	106:3	comfort 91:17,19	53:8 84:24 87:3
77:2 103:6 104:3	changed 21:17	coming 45:17	communicated
105:3	43:25 46:16 63:6	56:12	94:22
cases 22:16 23:12	66:24 67:6 77:8	comment 31:25	communications
44:3 68:4 77:5	77:17	commenting 48:23	45:1
cash 31:13	changes 43:24	comments 32:1	comp 94:15
catastrophic 71:7	47:20 69:21 77:21	50:25	companies 24:19
categories 37:23	77:23 100:4,6,7	commission 27:11	
87:14,16,17 88:6,9	103:12 104:7	27:17 34:8 81:20	69:25 71:3,14
88:18	105:7,9	104:19 105:25	72:22 84:24 86:19
category 18:25	changing 55:18	106:25	87:4
37:10	78:1,10	commission's	company 1:8 2:8
catherine 3:11	chapter 1:8 2:8	28:17	4:12 6:18,24 9:6
cause 38:24 40:9	22:16 38:16 77:2	committee 3:2,17	12:18,19,22,23
41:2,20 102:8,20	charge 13:12	4:1 5:6 10:10,13	13:4,5,15 16:16
caused 40:12	charter 13:7,10	12:2,3,5,6,9,13,16	27:8,15 28:9,14
53:13,22 54:14	chicago 3:21	12:17 13:12,17,21	33:11 38:16 43:2
causes 40:21	chris 5:5	16:21 19:14,19	43:20 47:6 49:9
century 4:5	circumstance 71:2	24:16,16 25:8	49:12 50:2,3 55:5
		26:11 27:1 31:6	55:11,16,22 64:17

[company - cut] Page 5

69:18 70:22 74:18	complexity 47:25	consistent 84:21	cost 72:6
85:8,22 90:7,17	complexity 17.23 comply 72:3,12	constituents 99:21	costs 83:23
97:3,18 98:11	component 23:11	constructed 25:22	counsel 45:13,13
99:12,17,19 103:6	30:10,17 31:7	consult 87:2	81:11,11 102:17
104:3 105:3	47:7 48:1 78:5,24	consulting 5:5	counter 56:14
company's 6:9	79:12,13 85:23	27:18 28:5	counterbalance
55:15 81:19 92:1	88:13,13 90:5	contact 9:1	92:12
comparability	components 88:14	contemplating	counties 40:10
30:12	comprise 85:22	46:10	counts 39:14
comparables	computer 102:12	context 34:17	county 41:16
86:20	concept 33:5	continues 99:17	104:10 105:15
compensated	56:22	99:18	couple 11:13
68:19	concern 92:13	continuing 91:3,4	27:21 73:4
compensation	concerned 92:13	contractor 33:14	course 11:7 43:21
6:14 9:7,16 10:10	92:21	33:16,19	56:13 63:15 68:15
10:13,21 11:1	concluded 101:16	contrary 25:10	68:15 69:24 71:7
12:2,3,5,9,12,16	concurrence 96:9	contributed 51:8	71:10 99:6
12:17 13:7,8,11,13	conditions 41:24	54:25 64:12	court 1:1 2:1 20:9
13:17,18 16:21	42:8,15 65:7	conversation	75:16 92:11 94:19
19:14,19 24:16	71:25 72:13	101:8	98:1 104:7
31:5 42:18,18	conducted 19:15	convicted 39:14	court's 50:4
43:13 44:5,10,15	20:6	39:24	crawford 2:18
44:17 46:20 50:5	confidential	copy 8:14 38:5	create 70:24 83:5
50:8 51:6 52:10	100:14 101:5	81:13,18	creates 68:9
52:17 55:13,20	connection 8:15	corp 12:17,20	creating 42:19
59:19 63:25 64:5	28:2 39:15,21	corporate 90:15	creditors 4:1
64:23 65:3,22	40:14,23 41:17,25	corporation 1:6	criminal 39:8
66:1,2,10,12 67:10	45:2,19 47:16	2:6 4:11 6:23	41:12,22
74:13 75:3 78:1	75:15	12:21 13:1 27:15	criticism 54:18
78:10,20 82:3	consider 26:15	103:6 104:3 105:3	csr 1:24 102:2
85:25 86:12 87:10	28:1 30:19 36:15	correct 8:13 35:12	culpability 64:2
88:21 89:1 92:25	38:17 39:1,11,21	61:9,15 63:4,23	culture 6:25 27:16
94:6,7 95:7,13	40:6,14,17,23,25	67:8 77:18,19	28:5 29:13 90:15
complete 72:9	41:7,17,19,25 42:3	84:10 85:1 89:5	current 31:20
102:13	42:19 43:16 65:3	89:10,13,16 95:24	currently 29:12
completed 77:6	69:2,5,10 82:8	96:5 102:15	customer 19:1
103:15	85:24 86:7 89:11	corrected 8:14	37:5,11 48:4 77:7
completely 97:14	considered 29:11	13:23 69:13 93:15	77:12 78:2,7,20,24
98:5	29:12 31:4 69:16	corrections 103:12	87:15 88:13 99:19
complex 47:24	considering 42:7	105:17	cut 20:24
I 3	,		

cwoltering 3:15	decision 6:17 27:7	designation 49:24	directing 74:18
d	50:11 90:18	49:25 50:1	direction 102:11
	declaration 8:15	desire 58:6 59:5	director 3:19 5:2
d 6:1 daniel 4:3	13:23 16:25 18:15	destruction 70:24	56:18,25
	19:13 20:8,17	destructive 38:25	directors 12:14
dash 15:16 21:2,3	21:16 22:8 46:21	detail 78:22	93:20
date 27:10 41:2,12	46:22 82:24,25	details 20:18	disagree 101:12
103:8 104:3,9,19	83:9 87:19 93:15	30:25 79:1 96:15	disagreement
105:3,13,25	93:16	deterioration	101:7
106:20,25 dated 38:15 41:12	declarations 75:15	93:19	disasters 64:2,13
81:21	deed 104:14	determination	discretion 43:13
dates 94:12 95:19	105:20	40:21 65:8 79:4	44:5 65:5,15 66:6
dates 94:12 93:19 david 4:14	deemed 103:19	97:5	66:9,13,16,17,19
david 4:14 david.singh 4:21	define 26:6 87:9	determine 19:8,10	93:21 97:21 98:13
day 102:22 104:16	defining 75:23,25	36:20,22 63:21	discretionary
105:22 106:22	definition 31:12	80:24	65:18
days 103:18	77:13	determined 10:23	discuss 46:23
ddenny 4:8	definitions 30:24	40:12 53:21 79:6	49:16 52:16,19,21
deal 13:8,12 78:22	deliberations 31:4	97:22 98:15	discussed 49:17
78:25 101:6	denny 4:3 100:1	determines 63:17	50:5,7,12 57:6
dealing 30:6 39:3	department	determining 35:6	79:7,8
40:21 41:3,5,13,23	103:22	36:15 38:24 40:9	discussing 45:21
42:8 71:25 72:13	depends 10:24	66:3 70:1 79:11	93:4
dealt 13:12 88:9	68:3	79:15	discussion 25:20
dear 103:10	deposition 1:16	develop 33:24	38:11 42:25 55:18
death 70:24	2:17 8:21 21:10	developing 18:18	55:20 56:2,4,9,16
debate 26:2,7	94:2 100:5 101:6	development	57:9,22 58:1,4,23
debbie 6:13	102:1,6,8,15,19	33:23	59:3,9,13,17,18,25
debtor 92:12,19	103:8,11 104:1,3	diego 85:5,19,24	63:24 64:17 65:21
debtors 1:9 2:9	105:1,3	86:14 89:11	65:25 66:10 67:9
4:11 8:16 9:14	depositions 100:24	difference 84:23	67:16,17 77:25
10:16,21 14:17	101:7	differences 101:14	78:9 90:25 95:14
16:10,17 17:3,8,9	describe 15:3	different 10:13	100:12 101:13
18:1,4,5,11,13,17	described 69:6	20:21 25:22 30:23	discussions 9:8
19:14,16,18 20:15	description 6:7	43:6 53:10 65:17	11:25 12:1,4,7
28:2 49:2,5 84:22	60:12 77:12 84:10	97:14 98:5	13:22 14:18 26:10
93:19,23,24 94:5,8	design 43:12 45:18	diligence 18:18,20	26:12 42:17 59:15
94:18,25 95:7	84:20,23 87:24	18:22 19:4	72:11 79:8
december 11:6	designate 100:13	dinyar 12:1 93:15	disengaged 91:9
27:10 41:3	100:16	direct 6:12	distinction 13:14
27.10 T1.J			

[district - exhibit] Page 7

district 1:2 2:2	earnings 30:19	69:13 71:16 80:2	establishing 69:6
41:16	31:2,3,8,9,13	80:7,14,18 90:7,13	establishment
division 1:3 2:3	east 3:5 4:5	90:20 91:5,8,16	38:14
28:18	economic 69:20	92:13,17,18,20	estate 25:6
dm 1:7 2:7	effective 37:24	93:1,3,7,23	estimate 11:7
document 15:4,19	92:7	enclosed 103:11	et 82:4 84:10
15:23 28:24 32:1	effectiveness	ended 20:8 81:22	evaluate 30:9,16
42:4 73:7 77:15	33:25	enforcement	34:12 43:8
documents 14:23	either 29:22	28:18	evaluating 30:6
14:25 15:3,6,7,9	102:18	engaged 11:6	evaluation 19:16
15:10 17:4 38:3	electric 1:8 2:8	86:14,17	19:18 20:6 22:11
doing 46:10	4:12 6:8,18,23,24	engagement 9:13	80:13
dollar 75:22 76:2	12:18 27:8,14,15	10:2,5,5,7 11:5,15	event 70:4
77:2	28:9,14 38:16	12:25 37:11 39:22	events 71:6
dollars 76:7	41:23 81:19 85:6	40:6,15,24 41:18	everybody 48:1
door 54:24	85:19 86:15 103:6	42:1 52:24	exact 30:25 57:1
doubt 100:10	104:3 105:3	enhanced 21:18	71:2 76:8 96:8
douglas 1:16 2:17	electric's 89:12	ensure 29:24	exactly 20:17 35:8
8:4,11 103:8	electrical 78:11	91:22	48:18 79:1
104:4,9 105:4,13	eligible 48:16 61:2	entered 105:9	examination 6:2
106:20	61:16	enterprise 24:23	8:7
downward 61:12	eliminated 82:19	32:8 33:23	example 21:11
draft 82:9 83:1,2	eliminating 65:4	entire 25:20 61:23	29:25 45:20 88:25
drafted 82:25	email 103:17	65:11,14 73:3	excavations 41:6
drafts 83:4	emphasis 22:13,21	104:5 105:5	excerpts 27:21
drive 30:3 32:17	22:24 23:3,20	entirely 65:18	executed 105:10
53:2,5	24:1,5 31:20	entirety 65:15	execution 104:14
driven 66:18	59:11	entities 53:18	105:19
dsr 85:16 86:10	employed 77:21	entitled 27:14	executive 9:10
due 18:18,20,22	employee 10:16,21	57:17 102:8	executives 13:8,18
19:4 30:10	29:22,23 60:15,19	entity 24:22 90:12	exempt 21:13
duly 102:2	61:23 62:9 81:1	equal 23:10	exercise 65:10
e	91:20 93:11	equipment 53:13	66:12
e 3:11 6:1,5 11:21	employee's 35:15	53:22 54:4,14	exercised 93:21
38:19 39:3	64:2	equivalent 23:25	exhibit 6:7,8,12,17
earlier 10:7 14:20	employees 11:2	30:23	6:22 8:14 13:24
68:13	13:13,18 18:13	errata 103:13,18	15:10 16:25 21:1
early 14:9 47:11	34:23 35:5 38:20	105:7,10,18 106:1	27:7,13,23,24 28:1
earn 20:2	41:4 51:8 52:24	especially 99:17	28:4,7,24 36:10
earning 30:9,17	54:24 55:12 56:11 64:12 65:23 68:9	esq 3:4,11 4:3,4,13	38:4,5,7,13,19,23
31:6	04.12 03:23 08:9	4:14,15,16 103:5	39:3,8 40:8,20

[exhibit - forty] Page 8

41:1,11,20 46:21	fair 90:11	finding 42:21	105:18
60:10 71:23 73:1	fairly 86:16	54:25	form 10:17 16:11
77:10 81:6,8,18	fairness 14:13	fine 57:15	16:19 20:7,10,16
82:11,24 85:11,14	falling 40:13	finish 57:17,18	21:24 22:4 23:4
93:14	falsified 41:5	58:15	23:23 25:11 26:4
exhibits 26:25	71:16	finished 57:18	26:16 30:21 31:8
27:1 100:24	familiar 13:14	73:4	31:22 32:25 34:14
exist 66:21 72:4	28:23 31:24 38:9	fire 38:25 40:8,12	34:25 35:19 36:12
93:9,10	86:17 90:23,25	40:12,20 51:19,23	37:20 39:17 40:3
existed 66:20	92:18	53:13,14,16,24	40:16 41:8 42:2
existing 14:24	familiarize 14:16	54:5,16,16,17 55:1	42:10,23 43:9
15:1 19:16,19	17:2	55:23 56:19 57:10	44:1 50:22 51:12
expect 10:15,20	far 12:14 65:1	57:22,23 58:2,5,24	51:16,20,24 52:3,7
expected 70:5	94:2	59:4,12,20 69:11	53:15,23 54:6,20
expense 9:17	february 49:4,4	fire's 38:23 53:21	55:2,10,25 56:3,23
experience 52:22	50:6,6 81:21 94:8	fires 52:2,6 53:22	57:7 58:3 59:22
66:15 92:17	94:25 95:13	54:13 57:6 70:8	62:4,11 63:2 64:3
expert 49:22 73:19	federal 41:21 42:7	70:14	64:14 66:14 67:13
expiration 104:19	43:5	firm 84:18 86:16	68:11 69:4,15
105:25 106:25	feel 78:5 91:9,22	first 12:25 20:15	70:9,15,25 71:17
explain 9:2 17:25	felt 47:14	20:22 21:23 22:18	71:20 72:15 73:13
18:5,12 25:8,10	fifth 32:6	24:13,14 29:9	73:21 74:5,16
50:2,7	file 100:8	38:15 83:2,17	75:8 76:21 78:14
explore 34:20	filed 41:12 49:2	fit 5:5	78:23 79:19 80:10
explosion 39:10,16	81:19	five 55:1	80:20 81:3,24
40:2 51:9	filings 100:21	flight 14:6	82:9 86:2,6,24
extent 45:1 49:8	final 27:17 82:9	floor 4:5	88:4 89:4,14 90:9
external 52:23	financial 3:17 5:5	flow 31:13	90:21 91:18 92:15
extra 81:12	18:5 19:1 22:13	focus 24:20 68:22	94:10,20 95:10
extraneous 70:4	22:24 24:5,9,15,20	89:25 99:18,18	96:20,25 97:11
eyes 100:17	24:24 25:17,24	focused 17:12	98:19
f	26:9 30:18,22	follow 14:14	formal 16:9,17
facing 70:23	31:20 32:4 34:24	followed 73:1	format 21:22
fact 19:24 20:2	37:5,11 48:4	following 33:22	formulate 10:11
25:4 26:8 30:21	59:20 66:23 67:5	46:1	formulating 10:10
31:1 53:6,8 56:5	67:11 72:12 74:14	follows 8:6 58:22	19:17
87:14	75:4 78:5 87:14	59:2 74:24 98:3	forrest 12:8
factor 25:1,15,17	88:12 93:19 99:18	force 18:13	forth 28:10,16
86:4	financing 92:12,19	forego 93:22	36:6 44:8
factors 52:23	find 72:9 93:1	foregoing 102:5	forty 11:16
59:25	100:20 103:11	102:13,19 104:13	

[forward - idea] Page 9

forward 55:13	89:11 103:6 104:3	95:6 97:3 100:10	head 11:19
94:19 103:15	105:3	100:13,16 101:4	heard 31:16
found 47:23 55:22	gate 14:8,9	good 14:5 48:8	hearing 101:1
foundation 73:14	gauged 77:21	60:3,4 64:11 84:8	hearings 100:21
86:25	general 17:20	gotshal 8:24	help 9:6
four 10:4 12:6,12	24:19 31:10 33:5	governing 36:5	helpful 92:3,5
40:9 54:12	37:4 39:19 56:6,6	governs 65:10	helping 37:24
fourth 28:20 55:1	64:17 67:16 90:12	grant 66:3,7,13	hereunto 102:22
fourths 54:23	96:9	grants 22:17	high 48:15
frames 68:4	ghost 51:23	great 14:7 57:18	higher 78:12
framework 97:17	give 26:14,19,22	greater 22:13,21	highest 61:16
98:9 99:11	68:21	22:23 23:3,20	63:15
francisco 1:3 2:3	given 25:5 36:9	24:5 59:19	highlighted 29:6
2:19 3:6 8:1 14:11	37:16 38:5 50:16	grounds 45:5	29:20 34:7,9
65:22	52:22 65:2 71:10	group 27:18 28:5	highlighting 29:8
free 104:14 105:20	97:3 102:14	guarantee 97:16	hired 8:23,25
freudian 99:9	giving 59:19	98:7	historically 47:6,7
friske 1:16 2:18	global 69:20	guaranteed 43:19	47:15
8:4,11,12,12 15:14	go 13:24 20:23	guard 36:4	history 17:9 18:1
57:20 60:9 81:17	21:1,2,5,16 27:6	guess 10:4 46:25	hit 29:22
82:23 87:22 103:8	38:2 46:21 53:10	84:8	hits 39:4
104:4,9 105:4,13	55:13 57:20 58:15	guidance 24:15	hold 97:9
106:20	61:11 74:13,21	guide 66:2,7,11,17	holding 12:18,22
front 22:3 38:3	75:2,12 77:10	h	12:23 13:5,15
full 8:9 102:13	80:6 83:14 85:16	h 6:5	42:19 55:12
function 36:2	87:18 89:21 93:15	hand 102:22	home 70:7
fund 24:25 72:23	goal 76:10	handed 81:17	horizon 68:20
funds 72:5	goals 17:3,5,7,10	happen 56:13	hostetler 3:3,10
further 75:15	17:11,13,16,19,19	69:18,19,23 71:5,7	hour 60:1
102:17	17:21,22 19:2,7,11	71:10	hours 11:8,12,13
future 68:16	52:25 92:1	happened 97:23	11:16 14:12
g	goes 50:17	98:16	hum 22:10 60:11
gaming 34:10,13	going 13:24,25	happening 47:25	77:14 87:21
34:16,18 35:14,16	16:24 18:24 26:2	70:4	hundred 11:13
gas 1:8 2:8 4:11	27:4 28:24 42:14	happy 98:22	hundreds 27:21
6:8,17,22,24 12:18	42:22 44:25 47:20	100:19 101:12	76:7
27:8,14,15 28:9,14	49:18 50:15 55:23	hardening 21:19	i
38:16,20 39:9,10	56:5 63:14 68:18	79:5,18 89:3	i.e. 53:5
39:13,14,25 41:22	68:24 72:19 78:14	harm 90:16 91:2,4	idea 34:2 62:16
51:11 81:18 82:8	82:16 89:20 90:19	91:8,11	64:11
85:5,19,24 86:14	91:6 92:21 94:19		

[identified - julian] Page 10

identified 21:8	include 33:13,15	initiatives 34:1	items 30:11
34:1	99:14	input 36:14,15	j
identifies 83:17	included 29:13	37:3 82:2 87:24	i 3:19
identify 27:4	65:23 103:13	instituting 41:1	january 41:13,21
ignition 54:5	inclusion 46:3	instruct 44:25	44:14,18 46:2,16
illinois 3:21	incorporated	45:4 49:10,18	46:20 47:2,11,11
impact 52:24	105:12	instructed 7:1	47:17 63:4 81:23
71:11	increase 24:14	instruction 45:15	94:6,15
impacting 30:12	increased 24:10	45:16,16	
impacts 55:11	78:4 85:19	instructions 83:3	jessica 4:16 jessica.liou 4:23
implement 6:18	increases 72:6	intent 75:14	9
27:9 28:10 29:18	increasing 46:7	interacts 57:24	job 1:25 36:10 68:22
implementation	59:13	interested 102:20	
28:16 33:25 83:20	incur 68:15	interests 97:6,17	john 11:18,25 14:20
importance 43:2	index 21:12	98:10 99:11,12	
important 11:1	indicated 96:6	interim 95:8,25	jointly 1:9 2:9
47:14	indicating 103:13	international 3:18	joseph 2:18 judge 38:13 41:21
impose 42:14,22	indicators 29:12	interpret 13:4	U
71:25 90:20	individual 35:15	interpretation	42:7,13,21 43:5
imposes 43:5	46:3,5,15,17,18,23	74:2,12 75:1	71:24 72:13,25
imposing 42:7,8	47:6,9,12,15,17	interrupt 57:14	73:10 74:3,8,11,25
impressive 72:6	48:1 60:14,19	interrupted 58:13	90:18 101:1,8
improve 36:1	61:2,11,18,20 62:6	investigate 51:7	judge's 90:25
imprudent 69:12	62:16,23 64:1,7,25	investigation	judgment 39:8
incented 91:23	88:22 91:20	27:12 40:1 41:2	65:6,10 66:20
incenting 90:4	individuals 9:24	investigators	julian 3:4 6:3 8:8
incentive 8:17,20	13:3 14:19,22	53:21	10:18,19 15:21
14:24 15:1 29:13	35:25 54:8 63:15	investment 37:14	16:14,23 20:14
30:3,22 33:10,11	63:21 65:17 87:2	investments 24:22	21:4 22:1,7 23:13
34:10 35:24 36:3	industries 31:11	24:25	24:4 25:14 26:13
37:7 43:3 53:2	industry 84:22	involved 20:4,5	26:18,25 27:3,7,19
57:24,25 68:20	inferring 74:9,17	44:4 77:1,2 79:10	32:2 33:6 34:19
69:12 72:23 75:18	influx 30:1	79:16	35:2 36:7,17 38:1
75:20,23,25 76:1	inform 42:6	involving 41:13,22	38:12 39:20 40:5
86:8 87:3 88:14	information 43:16	issuance 27:10	40:19 41:10 42:5
90:3,4,14 91:6,14	44:8 87:3 95:19	41:3	42:12 43:4,23
93:2	initial 9:19 24:15	issued 27:10 41:21	44:9 45:10 46:11
incentives 29:23	62:22	42:14	49:15,20 50:24
53:7	initially 20:20	issues 18:12 55:10	51:14,18,22 52:1,5
incentivize 68:8	26:8	69:18 71:8	52:9 53:19 54:1
			54:10,22 55:17
			56:1,17 57:2,5,11

[julian - material] Page 11

		T.	
57:19 58:7,14	61:25 62:1,9,13	lincoln 3:18	lowe 11:18,23
59:8 60:3,7 62:8	65:1 73:24,24,25	lincolninternatio	14:20
62:15 63:5 64:9	76:8 77:9,20	3:23	lower 74:15 75:5
64:21 66:22 67:19	78:19 79:23,24	line 7:2 14:15	ltip 22:16 29:14
69:1,7 70:6,12,18	80:1,9,11 85:10	18:15 19:5,13	m
71:13,22 72:17	86:19 93:9 94:1,5	21:14 22:9 38:20	madam 103:10
73:17,23 74:10,20	95:5,6 99:5 101:1	39:4 46:25 53:4	madison 3:20
75:13 76:25 78:18	knowing 53:24	72:1 85:18 87:22	mail 38:19 39:3
79:2,21 80:12,23	54:7	93:16 103:13	maintain 25:6
81:7,10,16 82:5,14	l	105:7 106:3	53:9 78:6
82:18,21 85:15	labor 72:7	lines 40:13 41:6	majority 47:24
86:3,9 87:6 88:7	lack 30:10 31:21	73:3	53:8
89:6,17 90:10	32:3 73:14	linked 78:19	making 26:1,15
91:13 92:9,24	large 77:2 86:16	liou 4:16	52:25 74:4
94:13,23 95:21	largely 96:13	list 28:19	manage 55:6
96:21 97:8,24	larger 76:10,11	listed 13:3 105:7	management
98:2,17,21 99:23	largest 75:18,20	105:17	13:21 14:19 17:6
100:4,7,23 101:4	76:2,19 77:5	listen 97:25	21:14,18 38:14
101:15	late 14:12	listing 105:7	44:22,24 45:12,17
julie 4:4	law 43:24	litigation 45:3	47:3,13 50:8,10
july 28:11 38:15	lawyer 89:19	little 82:14	63:20 64:24 93:3
june 40:20	lawyers 45:19	llc 3:18	95:14,22 97:4
jury 39:24	72:2	llp 2:19 3:3,10 4:2	management's
justice 51:15	laymen 90:6	locate 41:5	93:20
jwolf 4:9	lays 97:16 98:8	long 27:21	
k	99:10	look 28:7 30:5	managers 63:20 managing 3:19 5:2
karotkin 4:15 9:1	lead 1:8 2:8 99:20	71:23 85:11 91:10	manipulate 36:1
74:17	leaders 60:18	92:22 93:6,10,11	manufacturer
kazmierowski 5:2	learn 69:12	99:16	71:8
9:23	leaving 90:8	looked 33:3 38:21	march 1:17 2:21
kevin 11:24 14:20	left 22:9	48:21	8:1 102:22 103:4
key 29:11	legal 49:25 50:1	looking 13:2 18:23	mark 5:2 9:23,24
kick 69:12	103:1 106:1	29:2 48:11 78:4	41:5
kim 5:5	letter 12:25	97:14 98:6	marked 27:2 29:3
knew 32:24	103:19	looks 68:14	81:6 85:14
know 9:24 12:11	level 22:14 59:19	los 4:6	market 80:19 81:1
15:5 20:19,20	63:25 65:22 66:1	lost 70:7,13	
33:21 34:3,6,18,20	levels 48:23 80:8	lot 47:22,22,25	81:2,2,2 massive 70:23
34:22 35:8,11	light 9:7 32:7	68:14 82:19	material 84:22
49:24,25 50:1,1	93:17	loved 70:13	93:18
	73.1/		73.10
53:16,20 58:10,11			

[math - notary] Page 12

math 11:12	met 12:13 29:24	mislead 84:1	murphy 3:19
matter 9:18 43:11	35:18 70:7	mistry 12:1 21:8	n
43:20 56:7	metric 11:2 25:18	93:15,17	n 6:1
matters 10:14	30:18,22 31:8,9,12	mitigated 59:7	name 8:9 103:6
85:9	31:14 32:4 33:14	mitigating 59:11	104:3,4,15 105:3,4
maximize 25:7	33:16,20 42:20,21	mitigation 6:9	105:21
maximum 84:3	43:6,6 59:14,15	21:15 42:9 57:23	named 102:19,20
mean 32:23 34:18	65:2,9 66:23 67:5	59:12,20 67:11	national 39:25
58:11 65:13,19	74:14 75:4 77:7	72:1,14 78:11	nature 25:5
80:4 83:25 98:18	77:21 78:13,20	79:5,18 81:19	nda's 101:6
meaning 47:7	79:1,12,12 85:24	82:8 89:2 90:19	near 29:22 39:4
meaningful 30:1	88:11	modification	necessarily 68:2
means 34:2,16	metrics 17:23	22:12,20 26:23	necessarry 36:14
102:12	18:23,25 19:3,5,21	63:7,9	72:5,9
meant 78:7 96:23	19:23 20:7,8,16,19	modifications	need 58:17 91:17
99:4,5	20:20 22:6,12,21	20:20 23:1 45:25	91:20 100:20
measure 29:14	24:1 25:22 29:21	46:14 72:4	needed 59:10
30:20,20 31:1,3	30:6 32:7 33:18	modified 26:11	needs 10:24
33:24	33:24 34:5,22	41:24	negative 55:11
measured 19:25	35:4,9,15,17 36:16	modifier 46:4,16	71:5
48:2	36:21,23,25 37:1,5	46:17,19,23 47:9	nevada 40:10
measurement 53:3	37:6,6,9,10,12,13	47:12,15,18 61:3,4	never 82:11
53:10,11	37:18,22,23 42:20	61:11,19,20,22	new 3:13,13 42:8
measurements	43:7,21,24 65:17	62:2,7,17,24 64:1	42:15 43:15 44:7
85:20	66:2,7,11,17,18,18	64:7	news 38:24 40:8
measures 34:24	66:20 67:18 76:17	modify 46:4 60:18	40:20
36:3 85:22	79:8 84:13,20	moment 48:13	no.19-30088 1:7
measuring 29:12	86:21,22 87:7,9,12	90:8	2:7
mechanism 34:10	87:15 88:2,5,12	money 55:22	nominated 63:19
100:21	midwest 103:17	72:19	non 21:13 53:7
mechanisms 55:9	106:1	montali 101:9	normally 33:7,9
90:14	milbank.com 4:8	montali's 38:13	northern 1:2 2:2
meeting 44:15	4:9	month 92:23 95:3	93:18
50:6 63:4 82:3	millbank 4:2	morning 14:4	northstar 6:20
95:14	miller 12:8	mortality 21:15	27:9,18 28:5,11,17
meetings 12:6	million 76:10,12	motion 8:16 45:20	29:1,10 31:16,24
55:20 64:6	76:20,23 84:4	49:2,3 75:16 94:9	32:9
members 12:5,7	millions 76:7	move 57:12	notarized 103:14
12:12 66:12	minimize 29:24	multipliers 76:18	notarized 103.14 notary 103:25
mentioned 10:12	minutes 14:8,10	multiyear 32:16	104:10,18 105:15
48:20 82:2 96:2		32:20 33:3,5,9	104.10,18 103.13
			103.23 100.23

note 103:12	objective 55.16	onorotions 14.17	12.10 27.0 14 15
notion 56:7	objective 55:16 objectives 37:25	operations 14:17 30:10,17 31:2,7	12:18 27:8,14,15 28:9,14 38:16,19
november 54:17	68:23		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	observed 37:1	72:21,23	39:9,13,25 41:22 81:18 82:8 103:6
55:24 58:2,25		opinion 10:25 36:8	
69:11	obstructing 39:25	50:18 73:9 80:17	104:3 105:3
number 71:3	obstruction 51:15	90:16	page 6:2,7 7:2
78:12 103:7,13	obtain 86:20	opportunities 46:5	14:14 15:13 18:15
numbers 105:7	obviously 57:10	46:8 48:21 69:17	19:13 20:17 21:2
0	october 54:16	91:10	22:8 27:13 28:8
o'connell 11:24	55:24 58:2,25	opportunity 48:9	29:3,4 34:7 46:24
14:20	offer 50:20,25	48:23 76:4 102:15	60:10,13 72:1
oaths 102:3	offered 73:19	opposed 13:18	73:2 77:11 83:14
object 78:14,23	office 41:16	45:3	84:12,17 85:16
98:19	officer 41:11,14	order 28:8,13 29:1	86:10 87:18 93:16
objection 10:17	102:1	35:17 36:10 37:17	103:13,15 105:7
16:11,19 20:10	official 4:1 104:15	38:13,17 41:1,2,20	106:3
21:24 22:4 23:4	105:21	42:14 72:25 74:18	pages 6:10,15,20
23:23 25:11 26:4	officials 54:3,13	92:11	6:25 27:21 28:25
26:16 31:22 32:25	oftentimes 31:13	ordered 28:9,14	paid 9:17 43:14
34:14,25 35:19	oh 15:17 87:10	29:10,18 30:14	68:25 91:22
36:12 37:19 39:17	ohio 103:2	ordering 6:17 27:8	palermo 38:20
40:3,16 41:8 42:2	okay 13:16 15:15	orders 26:19,22	39:4
42:10,23 43:9	16:24 17:19 22:8	71:15,19,21,24	paradise 54:4
44:1 50:22 51:12	38:2 45:6,7,22	organization 19:6	paragraph 28:13
51:16,20,24 52:3,7	48:9 49:1 50:2	68:17	29:21 30:8 48:13
53:15,23 54:6,20	73:6,8 75:14,18	organizations	60:14 73:3 74:8
55:2,25 56:3,23	83:16 85:17 88:16	86:17	75:11
57:4,7 58:3,9 59:1	89:22 98:24 100:3	original 22:5	pardon 32:12
59:22 62:4,11	101:9,15	originally 62:18	75:24
63:2 64:3,14	ones 70:13 87:5	outcome 102:20	park 4:5
66:14 67:13 68:11	ongoing 9:7 30:11	outcomes 56:13	parkway 4:17
69:4,15 70:9,15,25	72:22	outside 66:20	part 18:24 20:1
71:17 72:15 73:13	ooo 1:4 2:4 5:7 6:4	76:15	22:19,25 24:15
73:21 74:5,16	7:4 101:18	overall 23:16	29:14,20 43:1
75:6,7,9 76:21	operated 79:1	24:10,11 55:15	48:20 57:10 60:21
79:19 80:10,20	operating 31:2,13	93:4,4	64:8 84:15 88:11
81:3,24 86:2,6,24	operation 30:20	p	90:1 105:9
88:4 89:4,14 90:9	31:9	p.m. 2:20,21 8:2	participants 46:6
90:21 91:18 92:15	operational 17:9	101:17	48:24 60:24 63:10
94:10,20 95:10	18:1	pacific 1:8 2:8	63:11,13 83:18
96:20,25 97:11		4:11 6:8,17,22,23	97:18 98:10
70.20,23 77.11		1.11 0.0,11,22,23	

participated 45:13	46:7 48:3,10,12,14	period 19:24,25	33:11,23,25 34:1
82:2	48:16 59:14 60:22	30:2 48:2,7 53:10	35:24 36:2,3,4,23
particular 24:19	60:24 61:1,4,6,17	53:11 55:7 59:7	37:9,14,14 42:9
31:1 59:12 78:21	63:7,10,11,12,17	63:16 64:20 83:21	43:3,11,14,18,19
particularly 14:20	67:6,6,10 74:15	95:9	43:19 44:7 48:2
14:21 30:1	75:5 77:12,17,18	periods 53:4 68:5	53:2 55:4,5 57:24
parties 102:18	78:2,6,12,25 79:4	personal 61:11	57:25 60:21 64:8
pass 72:5 99:25	79:17 85:22 89:2	personally 11:14	64:18 65:12,14,16
pay 49:13 65:16	89:8,12	104:11 105:15	65:18,20,23 66:18
65:16,17 69:12	percentage 79:13	personnel 72:9	69:6 75:18,20
72:19 79:25 80:2	percentages 78:8	pg&e 1:6 2:6 4:11	81:19 82:8 86:8
80:14,18,25 85:21	88:17	10:8 11:17,19	88:14 90:3 91:5,6
93:24	perform 19:20	12:17 13:1,13	91:11,14 92:3,4,6
paycheck 92:21	performance	29:7,18 33:23	92:6,8,14 93:2
paying 55:22	17:23 18:6,24	34:13,23 36:9	99:8,17
73:10 93:22	19:24,25 20:2	40:13 41:13,15	plans 10:22 14:24
payment 52:11,12	21:9 22:12,14,21	42:9,22 44:16	15:1,2,3 23:8 37:7
55:19,19 56:11	22:24 23:16 24:6	54:13 72:2,4,5,8	53:9 55:12 75:23
60:19 67:21 70:3	24:9,10,12,15	72:12,19 73:1,11	75:25 76:1,9
70:21,22 89:22	25:15,17,24 29:11	74:3 78:19 79:16	85:21 90:15 94:6
92:14	30:18 31:20 32:4	80:1,18 90:20	plays 57:22,23
payments 43:17	32:17 34:24 35:6	93:6 103:6 104:3	plaza 3:12
54:19 55:6,8 56:5	35:16,17 36:2,16	105:3	please 8:9 45:9
60:15 84:23 91:15	36:20,22,25 37:1	pg&e's 9:10 30:21	58:19 73:16
97:7,16,21 98:8,13	46:4,15,17,19,23	41:4,23 53:13,22	103:11,11
98:25 99:4,6	47:7,9,12,18 53:3	54:3,14 60:12	plus 80:25
payout 67:22	55:12 59:21 60:20	71:23 72:12 85:25	point 10:23 34:7
76:11 84:3	61:11,19 62:1,7,17	86:5,20 87:12	34:17 54:5 58:5
payouts 44:6	62:23 64:1,7,7,20	phone 4:4 5:6	59:4,9,17 60:3,4
peer 80:6	66:23 67:5,12	101:8 103:3	66:16 68:13 91:21
peers 30:21 31:11	74:14,19 75:4	phrase 56:8	points 40:11
80:8,15	76:17 83:21 84:13	piece 95:18	pole 21:13
pending 71:15	84:20 85:23 87:7	pipeline 39:14	pool 61:5,24 63:8
people 10:1 24:23	87:11 88:2 99:19	place 48:10 77:6	63:18 81:1
56:8 68:16 76:5	performed 18:18	91:6,12 92:14	population 48:15
90:6 91:22	performers 48:15	95:8 102:9	60:23
percent 20:3 21:12	61:16,17	placed 23:7 59:11	portfolio 55:15
21:13,14,15 23:8	performing 17:11	plan 6:10 8:17,20	portion 34:9
23:16 24:2,10,11	17:18,21 63:15	10:16 15:2,7	posed 44:20,21
25:16,18,24 26:9	performs 43:20	16:21 20:3 25:21	45:24
26:12 30:18 43:7		30:22 32:8 33:10	

[posing - really] Page 15

	I	I	I
posing 44:22	proceeded 46:14	provision 47:2	62:5,12 64:4,15
position 74:8	proceeding 28:19	provisions 84:19	67:14 68:11 70:10
positive 30:4 70:2	45:20	proxy 13:2,3	70:16 71:1,18
possession 92:12	proceedings 75:16	prudent 51:4 69:2	73:14,15,22 74:1,6
92:19	101:16	public 21:11 27:11	74:22,25 76:22
possibility 35:25	process 32:22	27:16 81:20	80:5 86:25 89:15
58:2,5,24 59:4	50:15,17 80:7	104:10,18 105:15	90:22 92:16 94:11
61:10 69:23	97:4	105:23 106:23	95:5,11 97:1,12
post 45:24	product 45:5	puc 26:20,23 28:8	98:19
potential 9:8	production 103:15	28:8 29:1,10,17	questioner 57:16
22:14 34:10,13	103:17,22	30:14 31:19 41:1	questioning 45:14
56:12 69:17,17	products 71:9	purpose 9:2 65:5	questions 13:25
70:3 84:21	professional	90:4	44:19,21,23,24
potentially 76:15	100:17	purposes 19:17	45:2,12,24 73:5
91:10	profit 30:20 74:4	pursuant 102:3	82:4,19 100:1
potentials 71:4	profitability 73:12	push 38:9	quite 71:6
power 40:13	program 21:15	put 22:12,21 72:2	r
practices 87:4	38:15 56:12 93:4	73:11 74:4 94:19	r 4:14 11:21
prepared 27:16	99:2	putting 67:10	
83:4	programs 18:13	q	raining 14:11
presence 92:10	project 10:9	_	range 20:1 84:10 84:20
present 5:1 75:14	propose 44:24	qualified 72:7,9	rate 13:16 72:6
pretty 81:23	proposed 20:9,16	quarter 28:20	rates 13:10 /2:0
primarily 11:18	24:13,14 29:21	quarterly 28:15	
primary 20:4	37:3 52:14 62:18	52:12 53:5,7,11	rationale 95:17
68:25 87:13 90:3	72:3,10,13 95:15	54:19 55:19 63:22	96:3,7,11
prior 9:9 30:2 46:1	95:22	66:3,13 67:22	reach 87:1
47:8 64:2,13 83:6	propriety 31:6	68:2 70:3,21 84:23 89:22 90:2	read 14:1 58:18,20
priorities 19:6	32:1 55:21		58:21,22 59:2
privilege 45:5	prospective 43:18	92:4,8,14 99:7	73:2,8 74:24 98:3
privileged 45:21	55:5 64:18 65:18	quarters 43:22	102:15 104:5,6,12
probable 54:4	97:15 98:6	question 7:1 16:12	105:5,6,17
		16:13 19:9 20:11	reading 75:10
_	provide 10:15,20		
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5	provide 10:15,20 24:20 53:4 91:16	21:21 22:18,25	103:19
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5	24:20 53:4 91:16	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5 probation 41:11	24:20 53:4 91:16 92:20	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5 31:23 33:1 34:15	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16 33:13 34:9 73:7
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5	24:20 53:4 91:16	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5 31:23 33:1 34:15 35:3,20 42:24	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16 33:13 34:9 73:7 98:1
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5 probation 41:11 41:14,24 42:8 71:25	24:20 53:4 91:16 92:20 provided 16:20	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5 31:23 33:1 34:15 35:3,20 42:24 43:10 44:2 45:8	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16 33:13 34:9 73:7 98:1 real 34:11
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5 probation 41:11 41:14,24 42:8 71:25 problem 54:11	24:20 53:4 91:16 92:20 provided 16:20 37:3 44:7 76:5 82:2 87:23	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5 31:23 33:1 34:15 35:3,20 42:24 43:10 44:2 45:8 46:9 49:9,19	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16 33:13 34:9 73:7 98:1 real 34:11 really 17:12 24:24
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5 probation 41:11 41:14,24 42:8 71:25 problem 54:11 problematic 72:7	24:20 53:4 91:16 92:20 provided 16:20 37:3 44:7 76:5 82:2 87:23 provides 48:6	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5 31:23 33:1 34:15 35:3,20 42:24 43:10 44:2 45:8 46:9 49:9,19 54:21 55:3 56:18	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16 33:13 34:9 73:7 98:1 real 34:11 really 17:12 24:24 31:25 34:3 45:25
probably 10:4 11:11 95:5 probation 41:11 41:14,24 42:8 71:25 problem 54:11	24:20 53:4 91:16 92:20 provided 16:20 37:3 44:7 76:5 82:2 87:23	21:21 22:18,25 23:5 25:4,12 26:5 31:23 33:1 34:15 35:3,20 42:24 43:10 44:2 45:8 46:9 49:9,19	103:19 reads 30:8 32:16 33:13 34:9 73:7 98:1 real 34:11 really 17:12 24:24

[reason - reviewed] Page 16

reason 50:12	recommending	relayed 95:16	86:11 87:3 88:2,5
52:19 68:25 78:1	50:11 95:15 96:10	release 38:24 40:9	88:21
103:14 105:8	recommends	40:21	respond 44:19
106:3	33:22	relevant 33:4	54:18
reasonable 37:9	record 8:10 27:5	relied 34:23	response 71:24
37:14,15,18 79:11	38:11 58:22 59:2	rely 35:4,15	responsive 57:13
87:15 88:10,15,18	60:8 74:24 81:17	remember 44:10	restate 94:11
88:23 89:3,9	82:22 98:3 100:12	77:16	restructure 84:25
reasonableness	102:13 105:9	repeat 16:13 45:8	restructuring 9:8
79:17 87:8,11,25	records 41:5 71:16	74:1,22,23 89:24	24:18 31:12,15
88:6,8	reducing 65:4	report 6:20 16:9	32:19,22 33:11
reasons 24:17 68:7	redwood 4:17,18	16:17,20 27:10,17	47:19 48:7 50:10
recall 18:10,14	refer 8:19	28:5,11,17 31:18	50:15,17 67:23
20:18 22:5 25:25	reference 103:7	40:14,17,25 41:7	68:3 69:22 71:3
42:11 45:25 56:25	104:2 105:2	41:11	76:14,15,16 96:14
59:15,16,24 65:24	referenced 14:19	reported 1:22	96:24 97:4
67:15 76:16 77:4	48:18,22 104:11	41:15 102:10	restructurings
77:23,24 78:17	105:15	reporter 2:22 8:6	53:9
96:8,14	referred 10:7	58:22 59:1,2	resulted 22:11
recalling 48:18	48:12	74:24 75:9 98:1,3	23:2
receipt 103:18	referring 10:6	104:7	results 24:20 30:3
recess 60:6 82:20	17:22 18:20 22:23	reporting 29:23	30:4 35:5 36:1
recession 69:21	35:22 66:5 88:1	30:2,4 35:5	retain 90:13
recollection 21:20	99:2,7	reports 26:14,19	retained 49:21,23
50:9,14 86:13	refers 29:1	26:22 28:15,18	retainer 9:19,20
96:13	refresh 21:20	34:23 35:16 39:18	retaining 90:20
recommend 50:11	86:13	53:17	retains 44:5
68:5	refreshes 86:18	represent 27:20	retention 9:3
recommendation	regard 26:23	request 50:3 51:3	38:15 90:2
26:15 29:18 30:8	85:25 89:12 92:4	93:24 95:1 105:9	retentive 90:4
30:13 32:6,18,24	92:5	105:11	rethink 56:20
34:8 47:10 50:9	regulatory 69:21	required 72:3	returned 103:18
50:13 62:22 63:1	reinforce 55:16	103:25	review 13:10 15:8
75:12 93:21	reinforced 43:3	requirements	15:11,23 20:5
recommendations	reinstitute 47:14	90:19	39:6,12 52:11,12
6:19 27:9 28:10	related 10:16,21	resources 72:3	80:7 87:7 103:12
28:16,25 29:4,7,9	96:14	respect 9:15 14:23	104:1 105:1
recommended	relationship 9:9	15:1 16:18 17:10	reviewed 15:9
32:8 47:13 62:2	relative 17:11,18	18:22 23:22 26:20	17:4 19:21,22,24
67:21	18:7 19:2 23:6,10	36:24 44:16 45:23	20:12,15,22 84:18
	71:20	49:9,11 50:10,20	

[reviewing - slack] Page 17

	20 14 40 1 42 20	1 40 7 10	10004
reviewing 14:22	39:14 40:1 42:20	seek 49:5,12	signature 102:24
reviews 15:19	42:21 43:1,2,5,6	seen 27:24 28:4	103:14
77:15 91:15	48:3 51:11 57:10	36:14 39:18 82:11	signed 8:15 104:13
revise 75:12 83:7,9	57:22 59:11,20	semi 53:8	105:18
revisit 32:6	73:12 74:4 78:6	send 14:25 15:6	significant 18:18
reward 11:21	85:20,21 86:4,21	senior 14:19 63:20	23:11 47:21 57:9
rewards 11:19,20	87:14 88:11,12,12	93:20	57:21 59:10
11:21	88:22 89:8 99:18	sense 99:16	significantly 83:10
richard 4:13 103:5 s	san 1:3 2:3,19 3:6	sent 14:23 17:4	signing 83:11
richard.slack 4:20	8:1 14:11 39:10	sentence 29:9	103:19
right 14:8 15:15	39:15 40:2 51:8	32:16 33:13,22	similar 86:22
22:9 28:11 50:16	65:22 85:5,19,24	separate 97:23	similarly 30:2
60:4 61:14,24	86:14 89:11	98:15	69:10
64:10 66:25 67:7 s	sansome 2:19	serve 28:18	simon 95:23 96:11
73:20 75:7 79:24 s	satisfaction 37:5	service 19:1 28:19	simpler 47:24
82:12 83:18 84:4	48:5 77:7 78:2,21	set 28:10,16 32:16	simplicity 48:8
85:13 94:16,19 s	saw 84:7	80:9,14	simply 46:9 72:2
95:2 99:3 101:12 s	saying 15:17 25:1	setting 19:2	sincerely 103:21
risk 58:6 59:6	33:8 34:4,6 35:10	settlement 41:15	singh 4:14 100:13
69:13	35:14,23 57:1	she'll 74:23	single 11:1 55:14
rjulian 3:8	71:15 73:11 74:3	sheet 103:13 105:7	sir 103:10
robert 3:4	74:11 75:1 101:3	105:10,18 106:1	sit 14:9
robinson 6:13	says 28:13 29:21	shell 83:6	situation 24:18
rockefeller 3:12	45:13 60:18 86:10	shifting 67:21	25:6 31:15 33:12
role 57:23	86:18 89:19	ship 51:23	47:19 69:19 70:22
roles 68:18	score 24:11	shores 4:17,18	90:13 92:5 93:19
roughly 95:3	sdg&e 6:12	short 8:16,19	97:14 98:5
	sdg&e's 86:7	57:25 75:22 76:1	situations 44:4
	seal 100:25 104:15	93:2	67:24 71:9,20
S	105:21	shortage 72:7	skikos 2:18,18
	second 27:13 46:4	shorter 32:21 53:3	slack 4:13 10:17
s 6:5,13 103:15	secondly 88:16	68:4,20	15:16 16:11,19
103:8,8 100:3	section 15:12	shorthand 2:22	20:10 21:3,24
safety 6:24 18:25	60:14 83:14,17,20	8:6	22:4 23:4,23
18:25 19:11 21:12	83:23 84:9,12	show 26:25 41:2	25:11 26:4,16
22:13,22,24 23:3,7	102:3	41:20 81:8	31:22 32:25 34:14
23:10,17,20 24:3	see 15:17 21:11,17	shown 103:16	34:25 35:19 36:12
24:23 26:15,20	28:12,21 29:5,6,15	sic 66:24 99:12	37:19 38:8 39:17
27:16 28:5,17	48:11,11,17 60:16	sight 53:4	40:3,16 41:8 42:2
29:13 32:8 33:14	62:25 68:24 77:11	sign 100:8,10	42:10,23 43:9
33:16,18,20,23	83:25 93:7,10	8	44:1,25 45:7,15
34:24 37:5,11			,

[slack - system] Page 18

49:8,18 50:22	specifically 59:16	18:23,24 19:16,17	subclass 88:22
51:12,16,20,24	specify 87:4	19:19,22,23 20:1	subject 30:6 80:19
52:3,7 53:15,23	spectrum 91:21	20:16 21:9,22	submit 16:9,16
54:6,20 55:2,25	92:2	22:6 23:2,2,12,15	28:15 75:15
56:3,23 57:4,7,14	speculating 35:23	23:16,21 24:6,6,11	submittals 29:23
58:3,9,16,20 59:22	spent 9:18 11:5,15	24:12 26:23 28:2	29:25 30:1
60:1,4 62:4,11	spur 90:8	29:14 30:10,23	subscribe 102:16
63:2 64:3,14	staff 9:25 10:1	31:7 32:7 33:10	subscribed 102:22
66:14 67:13 68:11	stakeholders	33:14,16,19,24	104:10 105:14
69:4,15 70:9,15,25	24:21 25:7 97:6	34:13 35:6 36:11	106:21
71:17 72:15 73:13	97:19 98:11 99:13	37:2,3,9,12,13	subsequent 26:12
73:21 74:5,16	99:15	44:11,17 45:23	47:13 82:4
75:6 76:21 78:14	standpoint 23:9	46:1,6,18,19 47:8	subsequently 63:6
78:23 79:19 80:10	stands 34:4	49:3,7,13 50:4	substance 82:1
80:20 81:3,12,24	start 27:23 29:8	51:3 52:11 54:23	success 34:23
82:16 86:2,6,24	38:3 67:4	55:14,19 60:12,15	sudden 29:25
88:4 89:4,14 90:9	started 21:23	60:19,25 61:21,22	suggest 47:16
90:21 91:18 92:15	starts 15:13 24:24	62:3,18 65:2,9,23	suggested 26:8
94:10,20 95:10	state 8:9 27:11	66:4 72:20 75:16	suggestion 62:20
96:20,25 97:11	71:14,19,21 81:20	76:9,19,19 77:3	suite 2:19 3:5,20
98:19 100:3,6,10	104:10 105:15	78:20 80:19,25	103:2
100:15 101:2,11	stated 102:9	83:15,18 84:9,15	summary 83:14
103:5	statement 13:2,3	84:19,21 86:5	superior 103:1
slightly 20:21	25:25 26:1 104:13	87:12,25 88:11	suppose 38:21
slip 99:9	104:14 105:19,19	93:12,23 94:8,16	sure 11:9 18:9
slowly 98:2	states 1:1 2:1	94:19 95:1,8	26:6 34:16 52:25
socalgas 6:12 85:5	85:18	97:10,13,15,16	58:6 59:5 61:20
85:18	stating 40:10	98:4,7,8 99:10	66:6 67:25 82:16
solutions 103:1	42:14	stips 15:13 23:9	surprise 31:18
106:1	status 28:15	47:8 76:1	survey 30:3
somebody 20:2	stay 25:16,18 68:9	straight 94:14	surveys 29:22 93:6
sorry 12:23 15:18	staying 25:24	strategies 9:7	93:11
20:13 23:15 33:2	stephen 4:15	street 2:19 3:5,20	switching 70:21
36:19 38:8 44:17	stephen.karotkin	strike 57:12	82:17 90:1
46:1,6 75:21 83:8	4:22	strong 24:20,24	sworn 8:5 102:6
84:2 101:2	steve 9:1	strongest 99:21	104:10,13 105:14
space 87:2	stick 89:21	structure 21:9	105:18 106:21
speak 23:25 35:21	stip 8:20 10:11	77:11 84:20 87:24	synonymous
91:19	11:5,15 16:10,18	structuring 53:6	31:14
specific 33:4,18	16:22 17:5,7,12,13	study 86:11	system 21:18
37:23 67:15	17:17,20 18:8,19		35:17 79:18 89:3

26 4 5 5	42 12 40 21 55 10	04.10	4
systems 36:4,5,5	43:13 48:21 55:10	94:18	transcription
79:5	72:22 74:19 76:4	threat 70:23	102:12
t	79:12 84:18 92:18	three 10:4 14:12	transparency
t 6:5	terrible 80:5	14:22 21:12 28:25	30:11 31:21 32:4
take 28:24 43:15	testified 8:6 18:17	54:12,23 87:13,16	transportation
54:8 61:23 64:1	19:14 22:11 87:22	88:6,8,18 92:22	40:1
71:23 78:8 82:14	93:17 94:2	thursday 1:17	tree 21:15 40:12
taken 2:18 27:21	testify 102:6	2:21 8:1	trends 17:20
60:6 62:10 82:20	testimony 6:13	tied 24:2 29:23	true 30:4 85:3
102:9	22:19 89:23	30:3 67:17	88:1,25 97:9
talk 79:25 93:1	102:10,14 104:6,7	time 9:17,18 11:4	102:13
101:8	105:6,9,12	11:7,14 14:1	trusty 94:24
talked 17:6 26:11	thank 23:18 99:23	43:14 48:2 58:5	truth 102:6,7,7
64:6 90:24	100:15,22	59:5 68:4,5,20	try 53:2 89:21
talking 14:21 19:5	thanks 99:23	90:8 94:18 99:23	101:13
talks 13:1 37:17	101:15	100:19 102:9	trying 11:7,11
target 20:3 46:5,7	thing 77:16 95:12	timing 22:14	25:6 53:1 56:15
	things 21:12 39:5	title 15:4	86:20 94:12
48:9 76:4,10,11,20 80:25	40:11 41:4 69:19	today 14:11 94:3	turn 13:23 60:9
	69:23 71:5,9	99:24 100:1	72:1,25 73:1
targets 21:9 29:24	73:11 74:3 87:23	told 18:2 94:24	82:23 86:10 93:14
32:7,17,20,21 33:3	98:24	tool 55:14	twice 58:10,12
33:5,10 35:18	think 9:6 10:24	top 61:16,17	two 14:12 45:25
team 9:10,22 11:4	25:23 26:8,10	topic 49:16 89:18	46:14 85:21 92:22
11:22 14:16 16:9	32:3 34:4 35:14	89:19,22	92:23 95:3,19
17:2 28:1 30:5,16	37:16 43:7 44:3	tort 3:2,17 5:6	type 31:3 90:18
32:14,18 38:17	46:10,24 48:22,25	27:1 54:11,14	types 34:5 37:6,12
39:1,6,11 79:10,15	55:4,9 67:3 68:12	81:6 85:14 99:14	37:13,17,22
80:13,16 81:4	69:2,25 81:25	100:18	typically 32:19
82:7 87:23	85:12 90:12 91:11	total 83:23	u
tell 17:9,16 29:17	91:16 92:3,4,6,7	totally 43:6	
30:13 31:5 46:22	92:10 97:13 98:4	towers 5:3 9:12	ucc 100:18
47:3 49:17 73:3	98:23 99:16,19	87:5	ultimately 43:12
73:24 79:3	100:24 101:6	trade 69:24	53:1 63:21
term 8:16,19	thinking 11:8	transcribed	um 22:10 60:11
32:21 57:25 75:22	third 29:2 88:20	102:11 104:7	77:14 87:21
76:1 93:2	thirty 11:16	transcript 2:17	uncertainties
terminating 55:12	103:18	100:5,14,16,23	22:15
terms 9:12,15,16	thorough 19:15,18	100.3,14,10,23	uncertainty 47:22
11:8 12:6 13:21		· ·	47:23 52:23 68:10
15:2 17:6 19:4	thought 33:2 41:14 50:16 93:7	104:12 105:5,11	68:14 69:3,5,10
20:5 24:1 25:6,21	41:14 30:10 93:/	105:17	91:3,4
	V I		

undergoing 84.24	69:17 90:14	ways 14:18	wisdom 55:21
undergoing 84:24 underground 41:6	vegetation 21:13	we've 11:24,25	wise 32:8
underlying 24:1	21:14,18	90:24	withdraw 19:8
understand 12:14	veritext 103:1,7	week 100:5 101:1	21:21
	106:1		withdrawal 49:6
13:11,16 28:23 35:3 81:22 89:23		weeks 92:22,22	50:21 51:3
	veritext.com.	weight 21:12 23:6	
101:2	103:17	24:14 59:20	withdrawn 10:18
understanding	version 22:2,6	weighting 23:8,10	withdrew 49:3
12:20,24 13:6,20	82:9 83:6,6	23:17,19,24 24:9	50:3 93:24 94:9
46:13 47:8 63:19	versus 13:15 20:3	24:12 26:9 67:5	95:1
72:18 96:1,22	24:6 49:25 70:3	77:12,17 78:3,5,10	
97:2	89:22	79:17 84:13 85:20	15:17,19,20 16:13
understood 95:17	viable 24:21	86:4 88:17 89:2,8	16:20 20:12 22:5
96:3,7,9	view 23:21 25:10	89:12	23:6,24 25:13
unexpected 71:11	51:2 91:1 94:6	weightings 19:22	26:6,17 31:24
unilaterally 65:11	99:20	25:21 59:16 87:16	33:2 34:16 35:1
65:13,19	viewed 48:15	88:22	35:21 36:13 37:21
union 65:23	views 93:2,12 95:8	weights 20:21	39:18 40:4,17
united 1:1 2:1	vii 29:3	67:17	41:9 42:3,11,25
unsecured 4:1	violations 39:15	weil 8:24,25 9:13	43:11 44:3 45:6,8
unsure 91:5	51:11	10:8 14:22 16:17	45:22 49:12,22
upward 61:8 63:7	virtually 68:1	49:5,11,16,21,23	50:23 51:13,17,21
63:9	vis 90:20,20	83:1,3	51:25 52:4,8
use 18:24 29:12	W	weil.com 4:20,21	53:16,24 54:7
65:6 66:19 83:5	w 103:5	4:22,23	55:4 56:4,25 57:9
100:23 101:4	wait 14:7,9 68:24	west 3:20	57:14 58:4,19,20
usually 72:23	waiting 90:17	whereof 102:22	59:7,24 62:6,13
utilities 27:11,17	waived 103:19	wildfire 6:9 42:9	63:3 64:5,16
81:20 86:22 87:2	want 14:14 55:7	42:20,21 67:11	66:15 67:15 68:12
utility 11:2 12:19	68:8 82:14 89:18	69:13,20 71:25	69:5,16 70:11,17
13:13,15 41:6	89:21,23,24,24	72:14 73:12 74:4	71:2,19 72:16
v	90:6 97:25 100:23	78:11 79:4,18	73:7,15 74:7
v 103:6 104:3	100:25	81:19 82:8 89:2	75:10 76:23 77:15
105:3	wanted 78:6	90:19	78:17,24 79:20
value 25:7 29:25	wanting 91:22	wildfires 40:10,22	80:11,21 81:4,25
99:21	wanting 91:22 wants 90:12	70:23 93:18	86:7 87:1 88:5
valued 91:9	wants 90:12 watson 5:3 87:5	willfully 71:16	89:5,16 90:23
variable 85:20	watson's 9:13	willis 5:3 9:12	91:19 92:17 94:11
		87:5	94:21 95:12 97:2
variety 10:13	way 14:13 15:14	wimberley 1:23	97:13 98:20 99:25
various 18:12 34:1	25:13 78:21 82:19	2:22 102:2,25	102:5,10,14,22
39:14 67:17,18	102:20	<u> </u>	

[witness - zero] Page 21

103:8,11 104:1,4	74:7 75:22 94:21
104:11 105:1,4,15	year 43:21 56:6,14
witness' 103:14	68:13,15,24 69:24
wolf 4:4	71:8,10 99:4,6
woltering 3:11	years 54:12 55:1
81:9,14 85:13	85:21
wonder 89:20	yesterday 14:2
word 20:7	york 3:13,13
wording 21:17	Z
words 56:19,21,21	
57:1 80:6 96:8	zero 20:2 61:19,23
100:8	62:10
work 10:9 11:17	
11:22 18:13 28:2	
31:25 44:16 45:5	
45:18 51:8 54:25	
69:22 72:10 81:22	
86:19 87:5 100:19	
101:13,13	
worked 9:24 10:2	
11:18,24 71:3	
83:1	
working 10:12	
11:5 13:17 21:23	
works 11:25	
worried 68:16,17 68:18	
wp 15:13 21:2,3	
60:10,13 77:11	
wrap 82:15	
written 16:17 65:9	
82:9	
wrote 72:2	
wtw 19:15 84:18	
86:11,14,16,21,22	
X	
x 6:1,5	
y	
yeah 11:10 16:15	_
21:7 26:7 66:8	
21.7 20.7 00.0	
<u> </u>	

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30

- (e) Review By the Witness; Changes.
- (1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:
- (A) to review the transcript or recording; and
- (B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.
- (2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF SEPTEMBER 1,

2016. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1112-2 Filed: 03/28/19 Entered: 03/28/19 16:34:16 Page 129 of 130

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1112-2 Filed: 03/28/19 Entered: 03/28/19 16:34:16 Page 130 of 130